

# THE THINKER:

## A MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL

APRIL, 1893.

NO. 4.

### THE SURVEY OF THOUGHT.

THE PRINCIPLES OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM AS APPLIED TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. J. G. HEISCH, M.A. (Hunt & Co., London).—In a brief pamphlet with the above title Mr. Heisch analyses and compares the two leading methods which have been made use of for obtaining an accurate text of the New Testament. The one is to select some MS. or MSS. presumed to be more accurate than the rest, and to take it (or them) for our guide to the exclusion, entirely or partially, of all others. This may be called, for convenience, the *eclectic* method. The other is to examine the whole of the MSS., and to adopt such readings as are supported by the greater number. This may be called the *diplomatic* method. He points out that these two methods rest on opposite assumptions, which cannot therefore both be true. The first assumes a degree of accuracy in the selected MS. or MSS. which renders their joint testimony practically infallible. The second assumes the equal fallibility of *all* individual MSS., and depends, not on their accuracy, but on their *concert*. It being the fact that even in the five great MSS.—A, B, C, D—there are divergences which mark the presence of errors of transcription, he considers that it is a mistake to rely solely or principally upon them for a discovery of the original text, while there are hundreds of later codices, which, though more modern in their actual production, may be derived from originals as ancient as any which are extant. The unlikelihood that any reading not in the original autograph should find its way into a large number of MSS. depends, he holds, not on their accuracy, but on their mutual independence. An example will best illustrate the position he takes up. The disputed reading, Luke ii. 14, depends upon the omission or insertion of the final *s* at the end of the word *eὐδοκία*. The traditional reading (*eὐδοκία*) is vouched for by every known copy of the Gospels but four, not to mention fifty-six fathers from every part of Christendom. Now, supposing that of these numerous authorities only twenty-five were strictly independent witnesses to the point in question, what will follow? Why this: That whereas the accidental insertion of the letter in a single copy would be a matter of every-day experience, and its presence in four might be easily accounted for, its omission in the five-and-twenty, which are, by the supposition, independent of each other, could not, without a miracle, have taken place if it had existed in the sacred autograph. "In preferring, then," he says, "the method which grounds itself on consent to that which relies on transcriptional accuracy, we are following the guid-

ance of God's Providence. He has not seen fit, by working a miracle, to provide us with a single perfectly accurate MS. But He has seen fit so to guide and order the course of events that a vast store of MS. copies of His Word has been preserved to His Church through the lapse of ages; and these silent witnesses, rendering their testimony from every part of the Christian world, furnish a foundation for our faith infinitely more secure than the correctness of any document, however venerable, transcribed by human hands."

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT AND THE NICENE CREED.—In recent times the statements of Christian truth drawn up by the early Councils of the Church have been the objects of attack. Under the influence of Greek philosophy, it is said, the religion of Jesus ceased to be a living practical fact, and became a collection of very problematical formulas intended simply to satisfy intellectual curiosity; and to restore the Gospel to something like its primitive power, it is necessary to strip off the artificial and foreign elements, which have been allowed to envelope and almost to strangle it. A somewhat favourite procedure on the part of these critics is to institute a comparison between the Sermon on the Mount and, say, the Nicene Creed. The one contains, they assert, a new rule of conduct, it formulates no beliefs, and the theological conceptions on which it rests belong to the ethical rather than to the metaphysical side of theology—metaphysics, indeed, are conspicuous by their absence from it. While the Nicene Creed is a statement, partly of historical facts and partly of dogmatic conclusions, the metaphysical terms which it contains would have been unintelligible probably to the first disciples, and morality occupies no place in it. The former comes to us from the peasants of Syria, the latter from Greek philosophers. The various fallacies which underlie this specious but superficial criticism are very clearly exposed by Prof. Bois, of Montauban, in his *Le Dogme Grec* (Fischbacher, Paris). But there is one point to which he has not drawn attention, and which deserves notice. It is, that there is no ground for asserting that the Nicene Creed has no direct bearing on morality, but is a mere piece of metaphysical definition. Morality surely includes our duties toward God, as well as our duties toward man, as is evident from the statement we find of it in the Ten Commandments. Worship was claimed by Christ, and was offered to Him from the very beginning. If He were a creature—even the highest of all creatures—worship of Him was idolatry, or, in other words, a breach of the first Commandment. Accordingly, the Nicene fathers stated in a formal manner the doctrine concerning the person of Christ, contained or implied in various passages of Scripture. Their decision was that the essential Divinity of the Saviour is clearly taught in the Word of God, and that therefore the Church was justified in paying Him that homage which is due to God alone. The non-ethical character of the Nicene Creed can only be maintained by those who assert that it has been a mistake to count the first four Commandments as part of the moral law.



**AUTHORITY AND DOGMA IN JUDAISM.**—The recent inhibition of a Jewish minister by the Chief Rabbi for objecting to offer prayer for the restoration of sacrificial rites, and for departing in his teaching from "traditional Judaism," has spread consternation among the Liberal adherents of the old faith. One of them, Mr. O. J. Simon, utters a protest in a very vigorous and ably-written article in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*. He asserts that belief in the restoration of sacrifices has never been held by the present generation to be an essential article of the Jewish creed, and that the prayers for such restoration contained in the Jewish liturgy simply express aspirations which have been cherished by individuals among them in all ages, but have never received the concurrence of the whole House of Israel. He goes on to affirm that, according to the teaching of the Hebrew prophets and of some of the great rabbins of the Middle Ages, the ancient rite of shedding the blood of cattle was nothing but a means to an end, and was essentially a ritual of temporary character, and that from the nature of things it can never be revived. "If," he says, "it were believable that the fulness of time could restore the desirability of superseding prayer and spiritual exercises by the rite of sprinkling the blood of rams and he-goats, it would also be credible that that rite would ultimately be exchanged for the one which preceded it, namely, the slaying of human beings." What he has to say about the belief widely cherished among the Jews of the restoration of their national polity is also very interesting. "That belief is not untenable provided that it is so held that it makes no claim against the progress of science. It is conceivable that the ancient soil of Palestine and of the promised land may be re-peopled with the descendants of the Israelites who drove out the Canaanites; but it is not conceivable that this return should take place without the advantages of later science. There may be a gorgeous temple again, but it is reasonable to suppose that it would be fitted with the electric light. It is not reasonable to imagine that ancient Judæa will be restored without railways and without the printing-press. Neither is it feasible to conjecture that the Jews will return, and not take with them the culture of the ages which have intervened since their dispersion. If restoration were to signify the destruction of all that has taken place in the long interval, no educated Jew could desire it; unless we intend to insult the prophets, we cannot entertain the thought that they meant a restoration to primitiveness. Had they done so, their claim to prophecy would be rudely shattered. There is no justification in human reason for the doctrine that a restored Israel shall imply a return to the conditions in which Israel lived thousands of years ago." It is very interesting to get this glimpse into the thoughts which are stirring in the minds of intelligent modern Jews, and to see that some, at any rate, in their community are not willing to bear the burden of an effete, stagnant traditionalism.

**EZRA AND 1 ESDRAS.**—In a series of letters which have been appearing in *The Academy*, Mr. H. H. Howorth endeavours to prove that the canonical book of Ezra, and the apocryphal 1 Esdras should change places—that the

latter is a translation of a much more trustworthy narrative than the former. His theory is that 1 Esdras represents the LXX. text of the same work which in the Hebrew Bible is known as the book of Ezra, and that the Greek version of the book of Ezra is a translation by Theodotion or some other person. In other words, that the codices of the LXX. contain two editions of the same book—the one (1 Esdras) a text approved by the authors of the Greek version, the other (Ezra) a translation of an inferior Hebrew original. It may be as well to remind our readers that 1 Esdras would seem on the face of it to be a compilation, made up of two chapters from 2 Chronicles, of the book of Ezra (in a differently arranged form), and of portions of the book of Nehemiah. To these is added from some independent source, the legend of the three Jewish youths at the court of Darius (1 Esdras iii. 1—v. 6). The attempt to show that 1 Esdras preserves a better and more reliable text than that of Ezra breaks down utterly. The first example Mr. Howorth gives, is that of the mistake in the enumeration of the gold and silver vessels brought back from Babylon to Jerusalem. In Ezra i. 9, 10 articles to the number of 2,499 are specified, while in ver. 11 the total is said to have been 5,400. The only explanation is that we have here an error which we have now no means of correcting. In 1 Esdras ii. 13, 14 we have a list which agrees with the number specified. Thus:

	EZRA.	1 ESDRAS.
Gold chargers .....	80	1,000
Silver chargers .....	1,000	1,000
Knives .....	29	29
Gold basins .....	80	80
Silver basins .....	410	2,410
Other vessels .....	1,000	1,000
	<hr/> 2,499	<hr/> 5,469

But it is very evident that the numbers in 1 Esdras are the result of an unskilful attempt to get rid of the discrepancy in the other list, and therefore have no value as an independent statement. The 1,000 gold chargers bear no proportion to the 1,000 silver, nor the 80 gold basins to the 2,410 silver. Again, Mr. Howorth says, "in the Hebrew text of Ezra (iv. 2), Esar-haddon, king of Assyria, is said to have brought the foreign settlers to Samaria. In the book of Kings this is attributed to Shalmaneser: so it is in Josephus. In the book of Kings the doings of Shalmaneser's successor, Sargon, are all attributed to Shalmaneser; and it would appear that it was Sargon who brought the strangers, and that the name is rightly preserved in the Greek versions of Ezra, where it occurs as Σαρχάδωνος. Esar-haddon cannot be right." To this we reply that it is quite erroneous to say that in 2 Kings xvii. 24 the bringing foreign settlers to Samaria is attributed to Shalmaneser: it is attributed to an unnamed "king of Assyria," who might by an unwary reader be identified with the Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, mentioned in the earlier part of the chapter. Even Josephus falls into the

error of identifying the two. Beyond the juxtaposition of the narratives we have no reason to suppose that the king of Assyria, whether he were Shalmaneser or Sargon<sup>1</sup> who carried Israel captive was the same king who brought the foreign settlers into Samaria. Indeed, the fact that wild beasts had increased to such an extent as to be a serious nuisance to the newcomers, leads one to suppose that the land must have lain desolate for a pretty long period—say from forty to fifty years (2 Kings xvii. 25, 26). This would be quite consistent with the account the Samaritans give of themselves (Ezra iv. 2), that Esar-haddon, the grandson of Sargon, had given them the territory they possessed. Mr. Howorth's assertions that the name Sanabassar (the leader of the Jews who returned under Cyrus) of 1 Esdras is a more genuine-looking name than the Sheshbassar of Ezra, and that the list of those who returned with Zerubbabel in the former book is fuller than that in the latter, can scarcely be ranked as serious arguments against the one book, or in favour of the other. Altogether, we have no hesitation in saying that the case against the trustworthiness of the book of Ezra has utterly broken down; while a very strong case indeed might be made out against 1 Esdras.

"THE RECORDS OF THE PAST," VOL. VI.—All Biblical students will learn with regret that this volume closes the series, as "the public seems to prefer books about the ancient inscriptions of the Oriental world rather than translations of the inscriptions themselves." And yet this regrettable result is not surprising. The obscurity of many of the texts, the abundance of unfamiliar proper names, the identification of which is often extremely uncertain, and, it must be added, the unattractiveness of much of the matter to the general reader, are amply sufficient to account for the limited sale of these very valuable publications. It is, indeed, creditable to the English public that as many as eighteen volumes of this kind have been published during twenty years. The new volume contains some important items. First in interest, as well as in order, is the preface by the editor, Professor Sayce, which is brimful of information. The inscription of Antiochus, which fixes the foundation of Seleucia in 275 B.C., and shows that it was peopled in part at least from Babylon; the inscription of Assurbanipal, discovered last summer by Mr. Strong, in which a predecessor of Astyages is described by an Assyrian equivalent of "child of the devil," and the tablet found by Mr. Bliss at Lachish, are successively discussed with the accomplished editor's usual ability. The Palestinian inscription is translated in full. The five most interesting among the following texts are letters from Phœnicia from the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, and fourteen tablets from Cappadocia, both translated by the editor; the prayer of Assurbanipal, Mr. Strong's paper on which

<sup>1</sup> The peculiar expression in 2 Kings xviii. 9, 10, "Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, came up against Samaria, and besieged it; and at the end of three years *they* took it," is quite consistent with Shalmaneser's having been deposed by Sargon during the siege. Sargon, indeed, claims the capture of Samaria as one of the first exploits of his reign.

attracted so much attention at the late Oriental Congress; the Sumerian version of the Creation story, which excited perhaps, even more interest, and a new translation of the inscription on the Taylor prism recording the first eight campaigns of Sennacherib, by Prof. R. W. Rogers. The first of these, the letters addressed to Khu-n-Aten (Amen-hetep IV., the heretic king of Egypt) by Rib Addu, the governor of Gebal, in Phœnicia, show, if correctly interpreted, that there were Greeks in the Egyptian service before the Exodus. An Ionian is said to have been sent on a political mission to the country of Tyre. Greeks in Palestine many centuries before Homer! The prayer of Assurbanipal—one of the purest and noblest expressions of Assyrian piety as yet discovered—is already known to the general public in consequence of the publication of some of its finest passages in the *Times*. Like the Oracle of Istar of Arbela in the preceding volume of this series, it proves that Assyrian devotion occasionally approached the sublime strains of Hebrew psalmists and prophets. The Cappadocian tablets are extremely interesting to the student of history. If Professor Sayce has successfully interpreted their significance, they give us glimpses of social and civic life in a distant Assyrian colony before the time of Moses. These expatriated Assyrians retained their original tongue, perhaps in a local form, still used the cuneiform character, worshipped in their Cappadocian home the gods of their fathers, and elected an eponym every year, just as if they had been in Assyria. Especially remarkable is the occurrence of Aramaic forms and of words hitherto regarded as specifically Hebrew. One word, "aparne," supposed to mean "chariot," or "litter," is believed to be identical with the hapax legomenon אפרון (Canticles iii. 9, "palanquin," R.V.), the derivation of which has long baffled Semitic scholars. The new rendering of the Taylor prism differs less from that made by Mr. Fox Talbot twenty years ago than might have been expected considering the enormous advance of Assyriology during the interval. There are, of course, many alterations in detail, but the impression of the narrative as a whole is unchanged. The earlier scholar reproduced the substance of the record with remarkable success. The improved translation lowers our estimate of Sennacherib's character. If Prof. Rogers has hit the exact meaning, the brutal coarseness of some passages has few parallels in literature. The volume closes with lists of the Egyptian dynasties after Manetho and the monuments respectively, with a table of contents for the whole of the new series, and with an index of the proper names in the first volume. Had all the six volumes been indexed their utility would have been more than doubled. It is ungracious, however, for those who have received so much to complain that they have not received more.



## CHRISTIAN THOUGHT.

### THE CHURCH AND THE LABOUR PROBLEM.

By REV. J. MARSHALL LANG, D.D.

In his able and interesting paper on "The Church and the Labour Problem," Mr. Keir Hardie brings a serious charge against the Christian Church. Of the pulpit, he says that "there is no place in which temporizing with wrong more abounds." And he urges that "if there is scepticism in the land (and who shall deny it?) the half-heartedness of the pulpit is far more responsible for it than all the destructive criticism of the Canon of Scripture ever penned." Even more severe are some of his strictures on the action of the Church, as, *e.g.*, "The Church has been content to follow the lead of the world in magnifying material greatness." And again, "The whole tendency of Church teaching is towards the assumption that the working man is an inferior creation who stands in need of being elevated."

In this condemnation, the member for West Ham reflects a feeling which widely prevails, and on which writers in journals and orators often ring the changes. I am far from asserting that it has no justification. The preaching of good men is occasionally not so much over the heads, as outside the hearts, of heavily burdened men and women. They do not come into touch with them in the things which evoke their interest or most express their need. But, as the advocates of labour insist on justice for those whom they represent, it is becoming that they be scrupulous in dealing out justice to those whom they attack. And in the accusation which Mr. Keir Hardie has formulated a threefold injustice is, of course quite unintentionally, done. There is injustice in what is stated, in what is omitted, and in what is suggested.

It is stated, for instance, that one of the latent currents of thought among preachers is to the effect that "the working man is an inferior creation who stands in need of being elevated." I venture to think that this is a misrepresentation. That the working man needs to be elevated is an assumption which the preacher shares with every one who champions his cause. But there is no clergyman worthy of his position, worthy of the name Christian, who bases his plea for this elevation on the ground that the working man is "an inferior creation." On the contrary, the effort to rescue him from surroundings which degrade and causes which corrupt is founded on the assumption that he is, equally with the rich, a man made in the image of God.

Farther, in the impeachment of the pulpit there is the omission of reference to the many ministers of religion who have taken, and now take, an active interest in the well-being of the working man. He never had a better friend than the Rev. Henry Duncan, the minister of Ruthwell, who was the founder of Savings Banks. The Bothy lad had never a more warm-

hearted supporter than another parish minister, Harry Stewart, of Oathlaw. When nobody had a good word to say for the Chartists, they were defended by two English clergymen, Rev. Frederick Denison Maurice and Charles Kingsley. And, without selecting any names from those who are living, I make bold to say that there are no men who, on the whole, are more genuinely sympathetic with those who toil than the clergy. They may not always go so far or be so pronounced in their views as Mr. Keir Hardie desires; but this does not arise from lack of sympathy or knowledge, or from a base policy of temporizing. A higher motive may be found for their caution.

Finally, it is unjust to suggest that ministers of the Churches deserve to be almost exclusively blamed for apathy or, at least, half-heartedness. The minister is not the Church; the Church is the completely organized Christian life. And all the constituent parts are to be taken into account. Each acts on the others, all act on each. The minister is only one of the constituents. Let the indictment be distributed between pulpit and pew. And, as the best way of improving the condition of the industrial class is to aim at a higher *morale* in it as a whole, to raise its normal condition, so the best way of quickening the conscience and action of the Church is to aim, not at improving the pulpit as by itself, but at nobler ideals of duty for all, at a warmer spiritual temperature, at a more effectual penetration of the entire membership by the Spirit of the Life in Christ Jesus.

An illustration of the defective conception of personal responsibility is supplied by a paragraph in Mr. Keir Hardie's paper. In it a reference is made to "the insulting spirit of patronage, overt and covert, which makes the clergyman stand in the mind's eye of so many of the workers as the type of all that is canting and unreal." Now, "a spirit of patronage" is always insulting. I honour the independence of feeling which resents being patronized; and the clergyman whose manner indicates that he looks on the workers as from a vantage ground, and that he is condescending to them, is a stupid snob. There are, no doubt, men starchy, and professional, and snobbish; but I should hope that the great majority are not. And let the other side of the picture be looked to. It is quite possible for a worker to have towards the clergyman a stand-off-ness which repels sympathy. Pride is a many-sided disease. If there is a pride of wealth, there is also a pride of poverty; if there is pride in "the spirit of patronage," there is pride also in the temper which is always suspecting patronage. But note what follows in the paragraph. "The poor worker is having his revenge. If he cannot voice his resentment, he can enter his protest, and this he does by not attending Church."

The same statement, in other forms, has been made to me again and again. What does it imply? Clearly, that the attendance at Church has to do with the minister. If he pleases, the attendance goes up; if he displeases, the attendance goes down. I suppose that, in the want of a high conception of the priesthood of believers, of the purpose of the Christian

Church on the earth, and the responsibility of its individual members, this mode of thought is inevitable. But to those who have some discernment as to these things, that will seem a strange kind of revenge in which the loss sustained is mainly personal to the one who administers the revenge—involving a dereliction of his own duty and the punishment of his own soul.

Is it not time that wholesale recriminations such as those which have been referred to should cease? They do little good; they do much harm. They overshoot the mark, and irritate many who are only too willing to receive a fuller inspiration for their work; they are misunderstood by others, who take them as an encouragement to think lightly of religion and worship; they widen the chasm between the Church and great masses of the toilers. I gladly recognize the religious spirit of Mr. Keir Hardie's paper; and I am the more anxious, therefore, that all which tends to embitter feeling should be removed from the conferences of men who, occupying different standpoints, desire to co-operate in the sacred cause of social well-being. Not a few of those who teach in the Church will endorse the statement, "I believe the democracy to be at bottom deeply and devoutly religious"; and the question which all who share this belief should submit, each to the other, is, How can sympathies, efforts, from the various positions in the line of social movement, best be utilized for the realization of a common end—that so well described as "a religion which can inspire and enthuse the soul to noble deeds, and which, while telling of a life that is to come, will insist primarily on the full development of the life that now is, and will make impossible the wrongs which, like a canker-worm, are eating the life out of the people."

Let us glance at some of the directions along which this co-operation may be realized.

"If the Church assume her rightful place, hers will be the honour of shaping and guiding the forces which are working the change." Thus Mr. Keir Hardie indicates the high calling of the Church. Will he—will all earnest men who hold with him that "the religion of Jesus Christ is more than sufficient" for all that is required—help towards its attainment? We are told, indeed, of a purification through which the Church must pass—purification from "the ceremonial and meaningless forms and phrases which pass muster for it." By all means let us have done with forms and phrases which have no significance, or which stand between the soul and the eternal verities. Truth must have its outward expression; the spiritual consciousness must have its embodiment; and the homages rendered to Almighty God should have the beauties as well as the simplicity of holiness. But we shall all cry, Away with "cant and unreality"! And when the demand is continued, that "religion must be freed from the perverted views of life which theology has so long proclaimed in its name," I, for one, ask, What views? There are, perhaps, too many theological definitions; the definitions are often too elaborate; some of them are possibly faulty and erroneous; yet, of course, we cannot part from the essential teaching of

Christianity as to sin, redemption, and grace. That teaching speaks to the heart and conscience of all men; let us give it straight, direct, and as men speaking to men, and I am sure that it will "enthuse the soul to noble deeds."

There is one view which Mr. Keir Hardie will not condemn as "perverted," and the enunciation of which is one of the special contributions of the Church to the Labour question. Referring to our industrial system Mr. Keir Hardie affirms, "It makes brotherhood an impossibility, and how can men believe in the Fatherhood of God unless they have for its correlative the Brotherhood of Man?" Here there occur the two words which are in, which are the very centre of, the message of the Church—*Brotherhood* and *Fatherhood*. If the Church can only so preach and teach these words as to make them "living creatures with hands and feet," she will render a service whose value it is impossible to overestimate. Let her give herself to the enforcement of these—"the principles of all true reform"—and let the special applications of the principles be the care of practical men in their legislative and social work. But let us understand. The sentence just quoted admits of a variation. Men, it may be urged, will not believe or realize the true Brotherhood unless they have for its correlative the Fatherhood of God. A brotherhood whose only bond is the sense of a common interest, the need of protection against others, and of such adjustments as will make the struggle for existence easier, will not deliver from "the lie which sinketh in"—the lie of selfishness. It will not make large-souled, generous men. It will make men loyal and resolute, and possessed by the idea of a community *within certain lines*. Beyond these lines the sympathies will not flow, the current of soul-action will be feeble and sluggish. Beyond these lines there will often be a scowl—that of class with its interests against other classes with their interests. We see already the working of this kind of brotherhood. The only brotherhood that effectually grapples with selfishness, that keeps thought and purpose in "a large and charitable air," even when personal or sectional ends are intently regarded, is that which has its root in the consciousness of the Fatherhood of God. On this the Church of Christ must stand. All are of it who recognize that the first and the last word of life—that on which all true and blessed social science rests—is Christ's word, "Our Father which art in heaven." Those to whom that word is not first and last part from it, and "take off their several ways."

Let the politician help the churchman to build the social structure on the Rock of Eternal Reality, and the churchman is bound to help the politician in his doing and striving. "The first duty of the Church to the social question is to understand it." Yes; and I heartily wish that there was fuller provision for instructing the clergy in the laws and principles of economic science. A man with wit and wisdom and brotherliness will read and observe, and probably, as he becomes older, will unlearn a great deal which he once held, and learn a great deal which he once disregarded. But it would be well to have those who are to help in shaping thought trained in the



knowledge of social problems. And it would be well also that in connection with every congregation there should be the opportunity of candid study and discussion of social issues. Thus and otherwise the Church may co-operate with the Legislature.

The demand is becoming ever more accentuated that social well-being shall be realized through legislation. I am not frightened by names. There is no use in calling such legislation grandmotherly. No sensible man will be scared by the application to it of the word socialistic. Where law can express and secure the deliberately uttered voice of the people as to rights or wrongs, let it do so. But the legislator cannot go before public opinion. He acts only when that is matured and consolidated. And in the formation of this opinion the Church can really "shape and guide the forces which work the change." With all my heart, I say, let her identify herself with the sons and daughters of toil. She has been too much the property of the middle class. So long as there are classes, she should comprehend and minister to all—not recognizing the class, but on the platform of their equality before God. But the poorer and the more struggling should feel that she is specially with them in all their righteous contention. She throws her power away if she meddles too much with special questions—questions with which working men, by their combinations and unions, have the instruments to deal. But in regard to all that pertains to life and its conditions, to the home and its conditions, to the demands of truth and justice, to well-being in its several aspects, the voice should be lifted up with strength. The time is past for the Church to be content with playing the part of a mere Lady Bountiful. The poor will be always with us, and their care is a special province of Christianity. But a far higher work is that to which this day calls—to develop a new energy, to promote a loftier self-respect, to emancipate from habits and temptations which coarsen and degrade, to give freer scope for all purifying, educative, refining influences, to make life sweeter, kindlier, and more wholesome. In prosecuting this work the Church will aid the statesman. All to whom the name of Jesus is above every name will be united in the solution of "the labour problem."

## **BIBLICAL THOUGHT.**

### *ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF THE HEBREW MONARCHY.*

#### *II.—LABOUR.*

BY REV. PROF. W. H. BENNETT, M.A

It may be well to enumerate a few of the leading problems connected with labour, partly because we shall thus be reminded that existing data can only give a partial answer to a few of our questions as to the conditions of labour in ancient Israel. We might first seek to discover the ratio of the

sum of available labour to the population on the one hand, and to its needs on the other. What proportion of the population might fairly be called able-bodied, and of what amount of labour was the average able-bodied person capable? In other words, what standard of health and vigour did the ancient Israelites attain to? The Old Testament gives little special information on this point. As a matter of general experience, Eastern labour is far less vigorous and efficient than European. But probably the general health of the community was not markedly inferior to that of a Western State in the nineteenth century: advantageous and disadvantageous circumstances may very well have balanced one another. On the one hand, medical and sanitary knowledge were most elementary; but, on the other, the simple agricultural life generally followed was natural and healthy; and again, the average efficiency of a modern population is lowered by the large number of feeble and diseased persons who are kept alive by the skill of modern medical science. But if, putting health on one side, the conditions and characteristics of Eastern life rendered labour less efficient in proportion to population than it is in England or America, this drawback, again, was counterbalanced by the moderate needs of the people. All that was necessary in the way of house-accommodation, fuel, light, food, clothing could be provided with infinitely less labour than with us; and in a thousand other ways the ordinary necessities, comforts, and luxuries of life could be obtained with a comparatively small expenditure of labour.

We now pass on to two further questions, which are really the same question from different points of view: What proportion of the available labour was utilized, and how far were the possible opportunities of leisure distributed throughout the community? What proportion of those who could work did work, and how long and hard did they work? We pointed out in a previous paper that the Israelite citizen was, as a rule, a land-owner. In the absence of rent and land-agents the land-owner worked his own land, with the help of his family and servants. Even in large holdings the owner can scarcely ever have been a mere receiver of the products of other people's industry, he must have exercised some general supervision; and on the ordinary smaller holdings the owner's own work and supervision would be the most important element in obtaining satisfactory returns. There were not many classes of the community that were not engaged in agriculture. Government was rudimentary and economical. The kings, princes, and officials of the court had their own estates; though doubtless the more powerful kings gathered round them idle crowds, who ministered to their love of pleasure and ostentation, and were maintained by requisitions on the harvests and cattle of the hard-working farmers. The most permanent and necessary portion of this royal *clientèle* was the body-guard of foreign mercenaries, which, however, can never have attained to any very large dimensions. Another class not engaged in actual labour was made up of the ministers of religion—the priests of the various sanctuaries and the prophets. The Pentateuchal system, which devotes one whole tribe out of twelve to the service of a

single sanctuary, had no counterpart in the actual arrangements of the monarchy. Probably, the total of priests and prophets combined did not make any serious deduction from the available industrial population. With regard to the women, agricultural life naturally drew into useful activity all the women of the household. A certain number of women would lead idle lives in the harems of kings and princes and great nobles; but these women were largely foreigners, and ancient Israelite life has no parallel to the modern withdrawal from all profitable occupation of the bulk of the women of the higher and middle classes. It is no great exaggeration to say that the provision necessary for the wants of the community was, speaking generally, produced by the united efforts of the whole community.<sup>1</sup> It will follow from all these considerations that opportunities of leisure were very widely distributed. Indeed, it is obvious that the natural conditions of agriculture tend to secure a large amount of leisure both to the farmer and his labourers.

We now come to the subject which presents most points of interest for the modern reader—the classes into which agricultural workers were divided, the relations between the land-owner or farmer and his labourers, and the conditions under which they worked. The classes of workers were, for all practical purposes, two, the land-owners and their families on the one hand, and the slaves on the other; but, for the sake of completeness, we will treat free hired labourers as a third class.

I. LAND-OWNERS AND THEIR FAMILIES.—The representative member of this class would be the owner of a small holding, cultivated, as we have said, by himself, his family, and his slaves. Such a small land-owner would be under certain semi-feudal obligations to the head of his house or clan, and possibly to the chief of his tribe; and the language of the prophets indicates that these obligations were often made the instrument of vexatious oppression and ruinous extortion. But, under ordinary circumstances, the small land-owner occupied a position of considerable comfort and dignity. Liability to foreign invasion was not an unmixed evil. The farmer and his stalwart sons, who could speak with the enemies in the gate, were bound to receive consideration and generous treatment from the nobles who claimed to lead them in war, and who needed their assistance to protect such wealth as may have been accumulated. Under powerful and victorious kings, like Jeroboam II., the nobles sought to grasp for themselves the holdings of poorer men who were no longer necessary as allies in war. Clearly, therefore, in his better days, the Israelite farmer enjoyed a far more satisfactory life than that of the modern peasant proprietor: he was not driven to the grinding and sordid drudgery which is so often the lot of the latter; nor, apparently, were the holdings repeatedly subdivided, so as to become too small to support a family upon each holding. The prophets who denounce the

<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the results of Israelite industry were often appropriated by foreign invaders, and though the Israelites retaliated, the balance was not in their favour. We may return to this later on.

land-hunger of the nobles do not seem to feel the pressure of any difficulty as to population; doubtless this immunity was largely due to the free play of the natural checks, war, pestilence, and famine. But throughout their earlier history the Israelites were still acquiring fresh land. They must have taken over much land from the Canaanites who remained amongst them; just as, after the Norman Conquest, there was a gradual and long-continued process by which Saxon holdings passed into Norman hands. On a larger scale, a tribe pressed for room more than once sent out an armed band of colonists to conquer for themselves a new settlement. Dan acquired a new territory in the north; and a careful examination of the most ancient historical sources suggests that Eastern Manasseh was also a colony founded from the West, after the tribe had taken possession of its Western inheritance and found the allotted portion too small for its numbers or its ambition. Probably other similar movements took place of which no record remains.

The honourable and healthy nature of the occupation of this class of workers is evident from the fact that the Old Testament records, in the most matter-of-fact way, the personal labours of its most distinguished characters, many of them members of the wealthiest and noblest families. The patriarchs, and Saul, and David do the ordinary work of shepherds; the Divine call comes to Gideon as he is threshing wheat; Boaz and the husband of the Shunamite woman personally superintend their reapers. Noble women lived with the simplicity of Homer's Greek princess of heroic times, who did her own washing; or the wife of the Macedonian king Perdeccas, with whom baking cakes was a regular habit, and not, as with our royal Alfred, an exceptional achievement. The ideal Hebrew woman depicted for us in Proverbs xxxi. seeketh wool and flax and worketh willingly with her hands. In modern times her servants would know that she was not a lady, and people in society would not call upon her; but in Israel, "her husband was known in the gates, when he sat among the elders of the land. . . . Many daughters did virtuously, but she excelled them all."

Perhaps the best modern parallel to the average Israelite citizen and his family is the well-to-do American farmer, settled within reach of Indians or Mexicans or unruly whites. The settler's life, with its agricultural industries, its spice of danger and occasional fighting, its sturdy independence and self-respect, reproduces some of the most important features of ancient Hebrew life.

II. THE HIRED SERVANTS.—This class was comparatively small, and does not seem to have been greatly appreciated. Neighbours, no doubt, did occasional work for each other, and sometimes might take pay, not merely by receiving similar services, but in some form which might be called "hire"; but the class of people who, without land or capital of their own, made a living by habitually hiring themselves out must have been very small indeed. The word *shākhîr*, *hired servant*, occurs only seventeen times in the Old Testament, always either in laws or figurative expressions, and not of actual named persons; we never see the *shākhîr* at work. The most



personal use of *shākhir* is in Jer. xvi. 21, where it refers to the mercenaries serving in the Egyptian army. On the other hand, *'ebhedh*, *slave*, occurs hundreds of times. In Lev. xxv. 6, a passage not earlier than the close of the monarchy, "thy hired servant" is classed with other members of the household, after the male and female slaves, but before the "stranger"; and in Lev. xxv. 53 we read of "a yearly hired servant." But these passages represent the growing complexity of social life before and after the Captivity. In the Ten Commandments, where we have similar lists of the members of the household, "the hired servant" is not mentioned. The Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx.-xxiii.) is largely taken up with laws about slaves, but makes no reference to "hired servants": it speaks of hired things (xxii. 15), but not hired persons.

Even at this early stage of the history of wages it was found necessary to invoke Church and State, then virtually one, to secure for "the hired servant" his due reward. Both the law (Deut. xxiv. 14) and the prophets (Mal. iii. 5) intervene to prevent the hired servant from being oppressed in his wages. Moreover, the failure of the system of hire to give the worker an interest in his work was already apparent; the feature about the hireling that chiefly attracted notice was his anxiety to get to the end of the day's work and handle his wages. When Job wishes to find a strong figure for his intense longing for death, he compares it to the eagerness with which a hireling looks for the reward of his work.<sup>1</sup>

In fact, we seem to find in the Old Testament the same half-contempt for the hireling which is implied in the words, "the hireling fleeth because he is a hireling." It will, however, be convenient to refer to this again in dealing with the status and condition of slaves in Israel. For the present, we may say that, if the Israelite land-owner may be compared to an American frontier-settler, the hired servant had points of contact with the "mean white" of the Southern States. As neither land-owner nor slave, he scarcely had any proper place in the regular framework of society.

There is one form of labour, specially common in the East, that may be classed with hired labour, namely, the *corvée*, or compulsory service for great public works. In the absence of professional contractors with organized staffs of trained workmen, such undertakings have always been carried out by forced levies of ordinary labourers. The great works of Egypt have been thus executed, from the Pyramids and Lake Moeris to the Suez Canal. Solomon similarly erected his temple and palaces by forced levies amounting in all to nearly 200,000 men; and doubtless other kings followed his example, on a smaller scale. Many of these labourers would be slaves; but the theory of Chronicles that they were all Canaanites was invented to save the dignity of the ancient Israelites. Nothing is said about pay for these levies; but, as they would receive their food and the engagement was temporary, they were for a time "hired servants." When Joash and Josiah repaired the Temple, we read of "carpenters and builders and masons."

<sup>1</sup> Job vii. 2.

Apparently, the building operations of the kings, and the growth of Jerusalem, had gathered about the city an artizan population; but we know little about them beyond the mere fact of their existence.

III. SLAVES.—The fact that Hebrew society rested like every other ancient civilized society upon a slave basis is effectually concealed from the casual English reader, though it may soon be discovered by the careful student even of the English Bible. The word "slave" occurs only once in the Authorized Version, and then curiously enough it translates the Greek word for "body."<sup>1</sup> Otherwise the Hebrew slave appears in English as "manservant" or "maidservant." The revisers have not ventured to remove these euphemisms from the text, but have gently suggested the real facts, by offering the marginal alternatives, "bondman," "bondwoman," "bond-servant." There is some justification for such reserve. 'Ebhedh and Shiphká (male and female slave) do not always stand for actual slaves. Moreover, a generation has grown up since the abolition of slavery in the United States, and as far as this generation has not read *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, "slave" is as vague and unsuggestive as "bondman." To those who have read *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and to older people, who have some general information about slavery in America, the word "slave" suggests an exceptionally painful and degrading position. Hence the use of the word "slave" in the Old Testament would have suggested that Hebrew slavery was as exceptional and offensive as the Domestic Institution of the Southern States; whereas in Israel, as in the ancient world generally, slavery was universally accepted as a necessary and natural institution. Apparently an isolated prophet or philosopher now and then anticipated Wilberforce by some two thousand years or more, but only by way of impracticable and daring speculation. Moreover, for reasons to be referred to later on, the slave system of the Southern States was more cruel and repulsive than any other such system that has existed on a large scale, with the doubtful exception of that of the Roman Empire; and English ideas paint even American slavery blacker than it really was, because it is chiefly known in England by novels and speeches composed for polemical purposes and emphasizing its worst aspects. But while the course adopted by the versions may be supported by important reasons, it cannot be wholly justified. "Manservant" and "maidservant" have associations altogether incongruous with the realities of Hebrew life; they suggest liveries and neat caps and aprons, and a month's notice and other modern devices, which were unknown to the ancient world. They have the more serious fault of ignoring and obscuring the great gulf that yawns between ancient and modern civilization. All fairly educated people know that slavery was prevalent in the ancient world; but the immense significance of the fact is seldom sufficiently emphasized. Greek and Italian enthusiasts, when they dilate upon the glorious republics of Athens and Rome, ignore the fact that these republics were not true democracies at all, but oligarchies of privileged citizens living largely upon the produce of

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xviii. 13.

slave labour. The working classes, as we understand the term, were slaves in these ancient states. The true history of the People for many centuries would be the History of Slavery; the great histories of Greece and Rome are the histories of ruling minorities. And this is true with the necessary qualifications and limitations for ancient Israel.

Mr. Ben Tillett has said that the modern labour questions arose when one man first hired another, and we have already had occasion to illustrate the truth of this remark; but we are chiefly concerned with it because it helps to bring out the contrast between ancient and modern life. The relations of life were more permanent in old times than now. The Land Question had not arisen, because farmers did not rent land, they owned it. The Labour Question had not become urgent, because, as a rule, employers did not hire labour, they bought the labourers out and out. The transient character of modern relations between labour and capital is symbolized by payment at so much an hour; the rigidity of ancient relations by absolute ownership. When rigidity thus takes the form of slavery, we are shocked and repelled; but if we are in any measure to understand Hebrew society, we must for a time put aside our modern ideas and try to forget the eloquent denunciations of anti-slavery orators. We must remember that what is an outrage on humanity in the nineteenth century was not felt to be such by either owner or slave eight centuries before Christ. We may even bring ourselves to believe that, in certain stages of history, slavery played a useful part in the progress of the race.

With regard to the efficiency of slave-labour in general, its inferiority to free labour has become proverbial, but in Judah opinion reversed this decision; in Deut. xv. 18 it is said of the slave, "He hath been worth double a hired servant to thee." Indeed, in a primitive community it is difficult to see how agriculture on any but the very smallest scale could have been carried on without the permanent and authoritative relations between employer and employed which were secured by slavery. Nor, on the other hand, would the slight organization of an early civilization have sufficed to secure even food for the labourers in slack times and hard seasons. Slavery not only secured to the master a permanent supply of labour, but also to the labourer permanent provision for his wants. Doubtless, a heavy share of the work was put upon the slave. Job's parallel figure to the anxiety of the hireling for his wages is the longing of the slave for night. The heaviest burden of drudgery fell upon the female slaves then, as, according to immemorial custom, the toil of working-women is most severe and their reward least adequate. The daily carrying of water and grinding of corn were heavy burdens to the female slaves. The continuous service of domestic life gave great opportunities to the harshness of any petty female tyrant; and while the possibilities of polygamy and concubinage opened a door of escape to the slave, the case of Sarah and Hagar reminds us that they often served to draw down upon her the persecution of a jealous mistress. But the life even of the less fortunate women-slaves must have

been a heaven of light and comfort, and liberty, compared to that of thousands of workwomen in London.

Indeed, there were many alleviations of the slave's lot, so that on the whole Hebrew slavery was as lenient and indulgent as it could well be. There was not that distinction of colour which cut off American slaves from the sympathy of their masters. When the slaves were Hebrews, ancient custom demanded that they should be set free after six years' service,<sup>1</sup> liberally furnished from the flock and the threshing-floor and the winepress, and from all wherewith Jehovah had blessed his master. Later legislation discountenanced altogether the enslaving of one Jew by another, and demanded that the Jewish slave should be treated as a hired servant.<sup>2</sup> The household, slaves and all, formed one family; from the master and his children, through the poorer and more distant relations, to the Hebrew, and then to the foreign slaves, was a gradual descent. Probably the distinction between the lowest class of freemen and the Hebrew slaves, or even the home-born slaves of foreign origin, was not very sharply drawn. In smaller households the master and the slave lived in close and constant fellowship in the field and the house, and this common labour must have fostered friendly feeling. The bastinado was used for slaves as it was to punish comparatively slight offences of free Israelites; but in the East such punishment is not degrading. The harshest provision of the law for slaves is that of the most ancient code, *Exod. xxi. 21*, "If a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall surely be punished; notwithstanding if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is his money." Probably even this law was as humane as the temper of the times permitted, and represents an advance upon the previous standard of morality. But further advances were made, and this law disappears from the later codes. While the codes of American slave States aimed at protecting the masters and keeping down the slaves, the Hebrew law sought to provide for their emancipation and protect them from ill-treatment.

There are other general considerations which suggest that slaves in Israel were fairly well treated, and that their lot was greatly superior to that of negro slaves in America, or even of slaves under the early Roman Empire. The Hebrew might look forward to freedom in Palestine; the foreigner might by ransom or escape return to his own land. There was no point in Israel or Judah more than three days' journey from a hostile frontier, and this possibility of escape for the slave must have tended to make the master fairly considerate in his behaviour. Shimei, indeed, was able to recover his two servants who had fled to Achish, king of Gath; but neighbouring states would not always be so complacent, and this event happened when united Israel was at the zenith of its power. During the Peloponnesian war the Lacedæmonian fort at Decelea in Attica received thousands of fugitive slaves from Athens, and the Athenian station at Pylos was the refuge

<sup>1</sup> *Exod. xxi. 2*; *Deut. xv. 12*.

<sup>2</sup> *Lev. xxv. 39*; cf. *Jer. xxxiv. 14*.



of large numbers of slaves who ran away from Spartan masters. In time of war the Israelite who wanted to keep his slaves must have treated them well. Indeed, in a moment of extreme peril in the last days of the monarchy, we read that the inhabitants of Jerusalem set free their Hebrew slaves, though they enslaved them again when the danger seemed to have passed over.<sup>1</sup>

Another circumstance that must have tended to consideration and humanity, was the fact that it was always possible that the master and his wife and family might themselves become slaves. The favourite daughter of a great house might be carried off by a Syrian inroad, and become a slave in a harem at Damascus, or be sold in the slave-market at Tyre to Greek merchants, who would sell their purchase again at Corinth or Syracuse. The thought of what the caprice of fortune might have in store for himself would be a bond of sympathy between the master and his slave which was quite absent in America; the white slaveholder could never become a negro slave.

The mention of such reverses of fortune reminds us that slavery would often be the fortune of the unsuccessful farmer who had been ruined by bad seasons and the fortune of war. This possibility may at times have been depressing, but it cannot compare with the gloom which the prospect of the workhouse casts over the closing years of many a life spent in patient and steady work.

Finally, the silence of the prophets, who were always eager to champion the poor, the suffering, and the oppressed, leads us to believe that the lot of the slave did not present any conspicuous or exceptional hardship.

We conclude, therefore, that as far as internal organization was concerned, apart from the chances of war, and the uncertainty of the seasons, labour in ancient Israel was pretty generally distributed amongst all classes, that in efficiency and mode of application it was adequate to the needs of the community, that each class had a respectable share of the results. The rudimentary stage of civilization attained by Israel involved the institution of slavery as a necessary evil, but the institution existed in its least objectionable form, at any rate as regards Hebrew slaves. We have little information as to either the number or the treatment of foreign slaves, but general circumstances suggest that they met with comparatively humane and considerate treatment.

<sup>1</sup> Jer. xxxiv.

## EXPOSITORY THOUGHT.

### THE VEIL OF MOSES.

By REV. P. J. GLOAG, D.D.

2 COR. iii. 13-18.

*Authorised Version.*—And not as Moses, *which* put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished: but their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which *veil* is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, *there is* liberty. But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, *even* as by the Spirit of the Lord.

*Revised Version.*—And are not as Moses, *who* put a veil upon his face, that the children of Israel should not look stedfastly on the end of that which was passing away: but their minds were hardened: for until this very day at the reading of the Old Covenant the same veil remaineth unlifted; which *veil* is done away in Christ. But unto this day, whensoever Moses is read, a veil lieth upon their heart. But whensoever it shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away. Now the Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, *there is* liberty. But we all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, *even* as from the Lord the Spirit.

THERE are not many variations in the readings of the different manuscripts of this passage, and these are of little importance, and do not materially affect the sense. The chief difficulty is in the interpretation—what meaning we are to attach to the different words and clauses. This is apparent from the numerous marginal readings attached to this passage in the Revised Version.

Paul alludes to an incident in the life of Moses. According to the narrative in the thirty-fourth chapter of Exodus, Moses was with the Lord forty days on Mount Sinai, holding communion with Him and receiving from Him the two tables of testimony containing the ten commandments. It would appear that during this period some change had taken place in his appearance: the glory of the Lord which he beheld was reflected on his countenance. Moses himself was not aware that any change had occurred: "he wist not that the skin of his face shone, while he talked with Him." But when he came down from the mount to the people, they were instantly cognisant of the fact, and were terrified at the glory which they saw shining forth from his countenance. "And when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, behold, the skin of his face shone, and they were afraid to come nigh him." In order to remove the cause of terror, Moses put a veil on his face. The use of the veil, then, was to conceal from the children of Israel the glory of his countenance, so that they might approach him without mental disturbance, and hold intercourse with him. According to this view of the incident, when Moses spoke with the children of Israel he wore a veil on his face; but when he turned to speak with the Lord he removed the veil. "And *till* Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his

face. But when Moses went in before the Lord to speak with Him, he took the veil off, till he came out. And he came out, and spake unto the children of Israel that which he was commanded. And the children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses' face shone: and Moses put the veil on his face again, until he went to speak with Him" (Exod. xxxiv. 33-35).

That Moses spoke to the people with a veil on his face is unquestionably the meaning given to this incident in the Authorised Version. But it is doubtful if we have here the correct translation of the Hebrew. It is to be observed that in verse 33 the word "till" is inserted. In the Hebrew, וַיִּסָּר means simply "and he finished or completed." Accordingly the Revised Version renders the passage, "And when Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face," thus favouring the idea that Moses did not put on the veil until he had finished speaking with the people. And this is the interpretation given to the words both in the Septuagint and in the Vulgate. In the Septuagint we read, Καὶ ἐπειδὴ κατέπαυσε λαλῶν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ κάλυμμα; and in the Vulgate, Impletisque sermonibus posuit velamen super faciem suam: "And when he had made an end of speaking with them, he put a veil on his face." According to this view, Moses spoke to the people without the veil, with his face shining and glorified, and did not put on the veil until he had done speaking. And this view best agrees with the language of the Apostle, "And not as Moses, who put a veil upon his face, that the children of Israel should not look stedfastly on the end of that which was passing away." The use of the veil, according to this view, was not to remove the fears of the people, but that they might not look at the end or fading of the transitory glory. From this it would appear that the glory of Moses' countenance gradually waned and faded, that the lustre became dim; and in order that the Israelites might not see its entire disappearance, Moses put on the veil. When he ceased speaking with them, he veiled himself; but when he went in before the Lord to speak with Him, he removed the veil, until he came out and spake to the Israelites all that the Lord had commanded him; while he was speaking they saw that his face shone, but when he ceased speaking he again put on the veil; so that the veil was the symbol of concealment and transitoriness.

Paul, as his manner often is, allegorizes this incident of Israelitish history; as if he had said: These things are an allegory; the veil on the face of Moses answers to the veil which is even now on the heart of the Jews. In preaching the Gospel, he observes, we use great boldness of speech; we put no veil on our teaching, as Moses did on his face; we have no fear, as he had, that our glory should vanish away: the glory of the Gospel, so far from diminishing, increases. The veil of Moses typifies the blindness of the Jews: that veil is still upon their hearts in the reading of the Old Testament. Observe here the implied contrast between the Jews and us Christians. The Jews read the Scriptures with veiled faces, we have our faces unveiled; the Jews have their minds blinded by prejudices, ours are enlightened with the

light of truth; the Jews cannot discern that the Old Covenant is done away with in Christ, they cannot look on the end of that which was passing away, we recognize Christ as the end of the law for righteousness; the Jews have the veil on their hearts, from us that veil has been removed.

The use of the veil, then, was to conceal from the Israelites the fading away of the glory of Moses' countenance, and this, according to Paul, typified the fading away of the glory of the law of Moses: "Moses put a veil upon his face, that the children of Israel should not look stedfastly on the end of that which was passing away." The law of Moses was to fade and disappear before the superior glory of the Gospel. The rites and ceremonies and sacrifices of Judaism having served their purposes as prefigurations of the privileges of the Gospel, were to be abolished. Now, this was to be concealed from the Israelites until Christ came. The revelation made to them was partial and obscure; the lights were broken, a veil was thrown over the future, they were not permitted to see the passing away of the law, its abolition in Christ. Had the Israelites been distinctly informed of the freedom and blessings of the Gospel dispensation, had its glorious privileges been made known to them—that such a golden age was before them, we can easily conceive how they might have become discontented with the Mosaic dispensation, with its bloody sacrifices, its burdensome rites and hindrances, and especially its vexing regulations concerning ceremonial impurity from which the most watchful and conscientious piety could not guard itself. This was, as St. Peter says, a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear. Hence it was in mercy that they were prevented looking steadfastly on the end of that which was passing away. And perhaps also the same reason may be applied to us with regard to the obscurity which hangs over a future state; there is a veil upon it which God has not been pleased to withdraw. The revelation of the blessings of the heavenly world might render us discontented with our present imperfect state, and unfit us for the duties of this world.

The glory of Moses' countenance was also an evidence of his Divine commission. When he spake to the Israelites the message given him by God, his face shone; the Israelites would see in this supernatural glory the proof that he was sent to them by God; it was the glory of the Divine Shekinah that illuminated his countenance; he carried with him the proofs of his authority as an ambassador sent from God, as a mediator between God and the people. Just in a similar manner our Lord was transfigured on the holy mount, when His face shone as the sun, and this impressed upon the wondering disciples the Divinity of His mission, that He was what He professed to be, the Son of God and the Saviour of the world.

The veil on the face of Moses was an emblem of hardness. "But their minds were hardened": ἀλλ' ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν. The word ἐπωρώθη denotes hardened, not blinded, as in the Authorised Version (comp. Rom. xi. 25), though blindness was the necessary effect of the hardening of their minds. Just as Pharaoh's heart was hardened, so was the heart of the



Israelites. It is not said by whom this hardness of heart was caused; it may be considered as produced by God, or as caused by the Evil One, but it is best to leave it undetermined. It is said that the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart, though the responsibility of hardening lay on Pharaoh himself. So, although the dispensation of God may have led to the hardening of the hearts of the Israelites, yet it was subjective on their part, they hardened their own hearts. Hence the comparative failure of Paul's preaching to his countrymen; they hardened their hearts against the proclamation of the Gospel. His success was great among the Gentiles; many of them turned to the Lord; but when he addressed the Jews, there were obstacles to overcome; their minds were already prejudiced against the Gospel.

"For until this very day," adds the Apostle, "at the reading of the Old Covenant, the same veil remaineth unlifted": "the same veil," the veil typified by that on Moses' countenance. The meaning is that even now, after Christ has come, and the Gospel has been promulgated, and the prophecies have been fulfilled, the same hardness of heart, the same incapacity for recognizing the end of the Mosaic law remains at the reading of the Old Covenant. The law of Moses was read every Sabbath in their synagogues, but the Israelites had not the capacity to discern its spiritual meaning, its fulfilment in Jesus Christ. It is not probable that there is here any allusion to the tallith or covering which the Jews put upon their heads at the reading of the Old Testament; the veil was not upon their heads, but on their hearts. By the Old Covenant (*τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης*) is here meant, not the Old Testament as we possess it, but the law of Moses which was the Covenant, which God made with the Israelites. The Apostle already calls it the Old Covenant, regarding the Gospel as the New Covenant predicted by the prophets.

The words which follow, *μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον ὅτι ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται*, admit of a twofold rendering. The Revised Version reads, "For until this very day, at the reading of the Old Covenant, the same veil remaineth unlifted; which veil is done away in Christ." And in the margin there is the alternative reading, "The same veil remaineth, it not being revealed that it is done away in Christ"; or the discovery not being made that it is done away in Christ. The second or marginal reading is to be preferred, as affording a better sense and more in accordance with the thought of the Apostle. It was because the truth, that the Old Covenant was done away in Christ, was unrevealed or undiscovered by the Israelites that the veil remained on their hearts. It is to be observed that both in the Authorised and in the Revised Versions *τὸ κάλυμμα* is regarded as the subject to *καταργεῖται*, which veil is done away in Christ. This, however, is doubtful; *παλαιὰ διαθήκη* is the nearest antecedent; it is not the veil, but the Old Covenant that is done away in Christ. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness; in Him the Old Covenant finds its completion; its rites and ceremonies having found in Him their fulfilment, it is done away with.

The veil on the face of Moses is transferred to the hearts of the

Israelites. "But unto this day, whensoever Moses is read, a veil lieth upon their heart." The veil is no longer on the face of the speaker, but on the heart of the reader. The veil is not on the law. The book is the same to all; the difference between those who understand and those who do not understand it is subjective, a difference of disposition: the minds of the Jews were hardened. And this was fully realized in the case of the generality of the Jews when the Gospel was preached to them. Although the prophecies pointing out Jesus as the Messiah were numerous and evident, although their fulfilment in Christ Jesus was clearly seen, although all the sacrifices of the law were emblems of the one great sacrifice for sin, yet the minds of the Jews were hardened; they could not understand their own prophecies, and they fulfilled them even by their unbelief. They had the Scriptures of the Old Testament in their hands, they were read every Sabbath in their synagogues, yet they did not understand them: the veil was upon their heart, the veil of ignorance, prejudice, and unbelief.

This veil of concealment, this emblem of spiritual blindness, shall be removed. "But whensoever it shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away." There are various conjectures regarding the subject of *ἐπιστρέψῃ*. Some consider it be *ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν*, as the nearest antecedent, "when the heart of the Israelites shall turn to the Lord"; so our two versions. Others regard it as *ὁ Ἰσραὴλ*; others as *Μωϋσῆς*, as the representation of the nation of Israel; and others the general *τίς*. It is best to refer it to the heart of the Israelites: when their heart shall turn to the Lord, when they shall be converted and receive a new heart, then the veil is taken away. Just as Moses put a veil on his face when he had finished speaking to the children of Israel, but when he turned to speak with the Lord the veil was taken away. There was blindness before, but now there is sight. *Περίσπειρα* is in the present; therefore not "shall be taken away," as in the Authorised, but "is taken away," as in the Revised Version. The moment the heart of the children of Israel turns to the Lord, that same moment the veil is taken away; the removal of their blindness is instantaneous with their conversion.

We have here a prediction of the conversion of the Jews. The veil shall be taken from their hearts; they shall recognize in that same Jesus whom their fathers crucified the promised Messiah, the King of Israel, and the Saviour of the world. "Blindness (*πῶρωσις*, hardness) in part hath befallen Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." At present *πῶρωσις* hath befallen them; the veil is upon their hearts; the Jewish nation is the most hardened against the Gospel, conversions among them are comparatively few; though some of the noblest Christians of modern times, as Neander, Delitzsch, Phillipi, Saphir, Edersheim, are converted Jews. But the time shall come when the Jews as a nation shall turn to the Lord, and this shall be accompanied with a great revival of religion, as life from the dead. The fulness of the Gentiles is inseparably connected with the conversion of the Jews. And even in the present day there is a spiritual movement among the Jews toward Christianity and the recognition of Jesus as the

Messiah, especially in southern Russia. These are the drops before the shower, the precursors of that plenteous rain which shall water the Church of God.

The connection of the words which follow is somewhat obscure. "Now the Lord is the Spirit" (ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν). The Apostle has asserted that the heart of the Israelites shall turn to the Lord; and he adds, as if in explanation, "But the Lord is the Spirit." He perhaps refers to what he had formerly said when contrasting the law with the Gospel: the law is the ministration of death, but the Gospel is the ministration of the Spirit. Ὁ κύριος is the subject, not the predicate; and by the Lord here is certainly meant the Lord Jesus Christ, to whom the Jews on their conversion shall turn. He is the Spirit inasmuch as the Spirit who dwells in Him is the Holy Spirit, and it is by the Spirit that He dwells in the hearts of His people. As Meyer observes, "Christ is the Spirit in so far as at conversion, and generally in the whole arrangement of salvation, He communicates Himself in the Holy Spirit, and this Spirit is His Spirit, the living principle of the influence and indwelling of Christ." As Bengel says, "Where Christ is, there is the Spirit of Christ; where the Spirit of Christ is, there is Christ." The same thought of the immanence of Christ by His Spirit is stated by the Apostle when he says, "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you. But if any man has not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." The Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit who resides in Him as a perennial fountain, and whose influences He dispenses unto His people.

The Apostle adds, "And where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Liberty here is opposed to the slavery under the law: the spirit is contrasted with the letter. The veil is the symbol of blindness, and so long as the veil continues on the heart, the spiritual activity is hindered; we do not see the truth, and therefore must stumble in our endeavours to attain to it. But when the veil is taken away, there is light and truth and freedom. We are then able to know our duties, and ability is conferred upon us to perform them. There is also liberty from the restraints of the law; we are no more bound by carnal ordinances, and even the commands of God are rendered easy to obey, they are no longer grievous, but the voluntary actions of our hearts turned from sin to holiness. When we receive the Spirit of the Lord, sin is regarded as bondage, and holiness as freedom. The liberty which the Spirit of the Lord confers is deliverance from the power and slavery of sin.

The shining on Moses' face was the reflection of the glory of the Lord. When he went to speak with the Lord, to behold His glory, the veil was removed, and that glory of the Lord was reflected on his countenance. So, says the Apostle, when we turn to the Lord, the veil is taken from our face, and we all with unveiled face behold the glory of the Lord. We all (ὅμοις πάντες)—not the Israelites merely, when the veil is taken away from their hearts—not we, the apostles and teachers—but all Christians; all who have turned to the Lord; we all resemble Moses, who appeared with

unveiled face before the Lord. The contrast is to the unbelieving Jews, who have still the veil of prejudice upon their hearts, concealing from them the light of the Gospel of Christ. With unveiled face we gaze upon the glory of the Lord (τὴν δόξαν κυρίου). By the Lord here is undoubtedly meant the Lord Jesus Christ. The glory of Christ is frequently referred to in the Gospel narrative. "We beheld," says St. John, "His glory, glory as of the Only Begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth." When Jesus performed His first miracle by converting water into wine, it is said that "He manifested forth His glory." And in His intercessory prayer for His disciples He says, "I glorified Thee on earth, having accomplished the work which Thou hast given Me to do. And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was." When He was in this world, He was in a state of humiliation; like Moses, He had a veil on His face. To the outward eye He appeared a mere man, without form or comeliness: there was no outward glory to attract the carnal mind. But even then the glory of His countenance shone through the veil of humanity; and on one occasion His face shone as the sun, and His raiment was white and glistening. The miracles which He performed were the manifestations of His glory. But the glory of the Lord did not consist in these supernatural actions; for, if so, we could not be transformed into His glory: but it was seen in the holiness, the purity, the sinlessness of His character, in His unquenchable love to the children of men, in His devotion to His heavenly Father, in His meekness and humility, in His unselfishness, in His forgiving disposition toward His enemies, and in His patience and resignation in suffering.

The word *κατοπτρίζομενοι* is only found in this passage; it does not again occur either in the New Testament or in the Septuagint. In classical writings *κατοπτρίζω*, in the active, signifies to show in a mirror, to make a reflection in a mirror; but in the middle, to look in a mirror, to behold oneself in a mirror, to see in a mirror. Two meanings have been assigned to it in our passage—that of the Authorised Version, "beholding as in a glass," and that of the Revised Version, "reflecting as a mirror."

The first meaning, "beholding as in a mirror," is more in accordance with the classical usage of the word. We look into the mirror, and see reflected in it the glory of the Lord. As Moses appeared unveiled in the presence of God, and saw a representation of His glory, so believers with unveiled face behold the glory of Christ. According to this meaning, faith is the organ of beholding; for it is only by the eye of faith that Christ is thus beheld. And the mirror in which the glory of Christ is seen is the Gospel, elsewhere called the Gospel of the glory of Christ. In this mirror we are enabled to discern the glory of Christ, the moral beauty of His character, the divinity of His person, the splendour of His ministry, the efficacy of His sufferings, and the extent and majesty of His kingdom. He then appears to us no longer without form or comeliness, but fairer than all the children of men. Then do our eyes see the King in His beauty. But



not only so, the glory which we behold has a transforming power: we ourselves are transformed into that glory—by beholding the glory of the Lord, we are led both to admire and to imitate; and just as the face of Moses shone in consequence of seeing the glory of God, so the lustre of the glorious character of Christ rests on the believer. The more we discern the moral beauties of His character, the more we will cultivate their moral perfection. The contemplation of Christ will produce resemblance to Christ.

The other meaning, "reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord," is, perhaps, not so strictly in accordance with classical accuracy, but is more suited to the Apostle's train of thought, and has been adopted by eminent critics. It is the view adopted by Chrysostom, Bergel, Billroth, Olshausen, and Stanley. The authority of Chrysostom shows that it is not at variance with the usage of the Greek language. It suits better the argument of the Apostle. He is speaking of the reflection of the glory of God on the face of Moses; so, he says, in a similar manner do believers reflect the glory of Christ. In this sense believers themselves are the mirror: Christ is seen in them; His character is so impressed upon them that they become Christlike. Like Moses, when he came from holding communion with God, their faces shine; there is a glory about their persons. They show forth the glory of the Lord. They bear a resemblance, faint and imperfect it may be, but still a real and striking resemblance, to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Thus, then, the Christian's life is a reflex of the glory of Christ. His life is lived over by them. They have imbibed the Spirit of Christ and drunk in His character. They become living epistles of Christ, known and read of all men. Their virtues are the virtues of Jesus Christ; the same Spirit which actuated Him actuates them. The believer shines in a glory not his own; as the light of the moon is but a reflection of the light of the sun, so the glory of the Christian is but a reflection of the glory of Christ. Christ Himself is the True Light that lighteth the Christian's soul.

The glory of Christ which the Christian reflects is increasing: "Reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, they are transformed into the same image from glory to glory." Different meanings have been assigned to the words *ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν*. Some suppose that the meaning is that this change into the image of Christ proceeds from the glory of Christ (*ἀπὸ δόξης*), namely, beheld in the mirror and reflected on us to our glory (*εἰς δόξαν*), our spiritual transformation to the likeness of Christ. But such a meaning is more ingenious than correct. The meaning rather appears to be from one degree of glory to another, and a higher, thus representing the progressive nature of the change. Compare, "They go from strength to strength" (Ps. lxxiv. 7). Believers have no reason to fear that their glory, like that on the face of Moses, shall fade, and at length disappear. On the contrary, the lustre of the Christian's reflection of Christ will increase rather than diminish. The image of Christ impressed upon the soul becomes more discernible. To adopt the image in our text, the more polished the mirror, the greater the exactness and clearness with which it reflects.

The great work of transformation into the image of the glory of the Lord is effected by the Spirit: "even as from the Lord the Spirit." Different meanings have been assigned to the words ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος. The rendering in the Authorised Version, "even as by the Spirit of the Lord," is inconsistent with the order of the words. Meyer renders them, "even as from the Lord of the Spirit," a translation which the Greek admits of. He maintains that the Lord of the Spirit is Christ, in so far as the operations of the Spirit depend on Christ, for the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ: Christ is the dispenser of His influences. But this is a title which is unprecedented, being nowhere else ascribed to Christ. The words simply translated are, as in the Revised Version, "from the Lord the Spirit," just as ἀπὸ Θεοῦ Πατρός is "from God the Father." We must never forget or place in the background the agency of the Spirit in our salvation. The great office of the Spirit is to glorify Christ (John xvi. 14). He displays to us in the Gospel, as in a mirror, the glory of Christ. He forms in the hearts of all believers the character of Christ, so that they reflect His glory; and He removes the veil from their hearts, so that they see the beauty of Christ. Thus believers are transformed into the image of Christ from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit. This transformation is effected by the Spirit, the Author, the Upholder, and the Augmenter of spiritual life, who sanctifies us until we grow up into a resemblance of the Lord Jesus Christ.

### "LET US HAVE PEACE WITH GOD."

ROMANS v. 1.

BY REV. PROF. J. AGAR BEET, D.D.

Few changes proposed in the Revised Version have met with less favour than the words quoted at the head of this article, as they stand in Romans v. 1, which in the Authorized Version reads, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Still more unwelcome are the renderings in verses 2, 3, "let us rejoice in hope of the glory of God . . . let us also rejoice in our tribulations." These important changes I propose now to discuss.

All these changes are due to a correction of one word, and indeed of one letter, in the Greek text of the epistle. Instead of "*we have peace*," the oldest and best manuscripts and versions and fathers agree to read, "*let us have peace*." The reading which underlies the rendering "*we have peace*" is not found, by the first hand, in any copy earlier than the ninth century, although it is found in corrections of the Sinai and Vatican MSS. dating back possibly to the fourth and sixth centuries respectively. Nor can we trace it with confidence to any early quotation. On the other hand, for the reading, "*let us have peace*," we find testimony practically unanimous, reaching back to the second century and coming to us from various and widely distant sources.

This abundant evidence is accepted with confidence in all recent critical

editions of the Greek text, by Tischendorf in his last edition, by Tregelles, and by Westcott and Hort. It is accepted by the English revisers with a singularly mild marginal note, "some authorities read, *we have*." The American revisers prefer "*we have peace*"; adding, "many ancient authorities read *let us have peace*."

Every one admits the great preponderance of documentary evidence for the reading, "let us have peace." Those who reject it do so only because they find themselves unable to give to these words any satisfactory sense. It is the purpose of this paper to show that this difficulty arises merely from a misunderstanding and mistranslation of the words found in the ancient copies.

The revisers translate, "being, therefore justified by faith, let us have peace with God." This suggests or implies that the readers are already justified but have not yet peace with God, and that St. Paul urges them, inasmuch as they are already justified, to seek for and obtain peace with God. Now, justification and peace with God are manifestly equivalent terms. For every monarch is at peace with a pardoned criminal. Moreover, in verses 10, 11, St. Paul assumes and asserts that his readers are already reconciled to God. It must be admitted that, if the revisers' rendering be correct, the reading so widely attested will present a most serious difficulty.

It seems to me that the revisers have misunderstood a very common Greek construction, viz., the aorist participle preceding a subjunctive or imperative. This construction implies simply, in the passage before us, that the abiding state of peace with God must be preceded by the event of justification; and leaves the context to determine whether justification is already obtained and is a reason for having peace with God, or whether justification by faith is the gateway by which we must enter the abiding state of peace with God.

That this latter is St. Paul's meaning in this passage, is suggested very strongly by the fact that this is the meaning of the aorist participle in, I believe, all the very many passages in which the construction before us is used in the New Testament. So, in 1 Cor. vi. 15, "shall I then take away the members of Christ, and make them members of a harlot?"; Acts xv. 36, "let us return now and visit the brethren"; Ephes. iv. 25, "wherefore, putting away falsehood, speak ye truth each one with his neighbour"; Heb. vi. 1, "wherefore let us cease to speak of the first principles of Christ, and press on unto perfection." Also Matt. ii. 8, 13, 20, iv. 9, v. 24, vi. 6, vii. 6, ix. 13, 18, xi. 4, xiii. 28, xvii. 27, xxii. 13, xxvii. 64, xxviii. 19. The above renderings show how, in other places, the revisers treat the construction now before us.

In the LXX. the same construction is very common as a rendering of two Hebrew imperatives, jussives, or cohortatives. So Gen. xi. 7, "let us go down and there confound their language"; xviii. 21, "I will go down now and see"; also xix. 2, 15, 34. This rendering reveals a difference

between the Greek language on the one hand and the Hebrew and English languages on the other. In all the above passages the Greek writer looks upon the action denoted by the participle, not as itself an object of desire, but as subordinate to, and needful to bring about the action or state denoted by the finite verb. This grouping of subordinate thoughts around the main thought is a conspicuous and beautiful feature of the Greek language. In such cases the Hebrew language uses two imperatives or cohortatives. But, in the passages quoted above from the Old Testament, the former exhortation is evidently subordinate to the latter. The Greek translations were therefore at liberty to use the rendering most in harmony with the genius of their own language. And in the passages quoted above the English revisers have correctly, where it seemed good to them, translated the Greek construction now before us by two English imperatives, in harmony with the genius of their own language.

So far as I know, Rom. v. 1 is the only passage in which the revisers interpret an aorist participle preceding a present subjunctive as describing an event which has already taken place. It is a solitary exception in their treatment of a common Greek construction.

It is right to say that in Romans v. 9, 10, an aorist participle preceding a future indicative describes an event which has already taken place, and which affords a ground of expectation of something still future. But the future indicative is not an exact parallel to the present subjunctive. Moreover, an aorist participle preceding even a future indication denotes not unfrequently an event still future. So Romans xv. 28, "when therefore I have accomplished this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will go on by you unto Spain"; also Acts xxiv. 25; 1 Peter v. 4. These passages prove that an aorist participle preceding an indicative future does not necessarily imply that the event denoted by the participle has already taken place. Whether this event is looked upon as past or future must be determined by the context.

In view of the evident meaning of the passages quoted above, and in harmony with the revisers' own rendering of most of them, I venture to render the passage now before us, *LET US THEN, JUSTIFIED THROUGH FAITH, HAVE PEACE WITH GOD.* This rendering implies, in agreement with the use of the same Greek construction throughout the New Testament, not that justification has already taken place and is a reason for going on to a higher blessing, viz., peace with God, but that to the writer's thought justification through faith is simply looked upon as a means by which *we may have peace with God.*

To this natural rendering of a common Greek construction there is only one serious objection. How can St. Paul point to justification as a means of peace with God, when in ver. 9 he assumes that his readers are already justified? As an objection to my rendering, this question may be answered by asking another, How can St. Paul in ver. 1 write, "Let us have peace with God," and in ver. 11, "We have now received the reconciliation"? For reconciliation implies peace with God. But both questions require an answer.



An answer will, I believe, be found in St. Paul's mode of thought. So intense is his realization of whatever he describes, that frequently he identifies himself with it and makes it the ideal standpoint of his thought, a standpoint rapidly changing with the progress of his discourse. So in Romans iv. 24 he throws himself back to the days of Abraham, about whom he has been writing, and looks forward to the Gospel as still future: "For our sakes also, unto whom it shall be reckoned, who believe on him that raised Jesus." From the future indicative in Romans iv. 24, the Apostle passes to the present subjunctive in chap. v. 1, and exhorts his readers to appropriate the reconciliation with God involved in faith reckoned for righteousness. This exhortation he prefaces, and sums up what he has said before, by interjecting the words "justified through faith." He thus points to the means of reconciliation.

What St. Paul in ver. 1 exhorts his readers to do, he assumes in ver. 2 that they have already done: "through whom also we have had our access into this grace in which we stand." For indisputably they who *stand* (a favourite word of St. Paul, denoting Christian steadfastness) in the grace of God have already peace with God. In other words, we cannot interpret the change from the future indicative in chap. iv. 24 to the present subjunctive in chap. v. 1, and to the perfect indicative in ver. 2, except as written from an ideal and changing standpoint.

If we accept this explanation of the change of tense, future, present, past, we may accept for vers. 2b, 3, the rendering in the revisers' margin: "and we rejoice in hope of the glory of God, and . . . in our tribulations." For the transition is now complete. They who already stand in the grace of God may well exult in hope of glory.

The exhortation in ver. 1, "let us have peace with God," is the more appropriate because, although St. Paul himself enjoyed a present and assured peace with God, he could not forget that many of his readers had not the same rest of faith. Their weaker faith he helps by the example of his own unshaken confidence, and by placing himself at their side, and by claiming along with them the peace with God which is the immediate result of justifying faith.

An ideal and changing standpoint appears again and again throughout this great epistle. In chap. iii. 7, St. Paul puts himself among liars and asks, "If the truth of God through my lie abounded to His glory, why am I also judged as a sinner?" In ver. 9, leaving out of sight those justified through faith, he says, "we have charged both Jews and Greeks that they are all under sin." This is the only explanation of the dark picture of himself drawn in chap. vii. 14-24, until in ver. 25 light shines upon him through Jesus Christ. For the moral bondage there described is utterly inconsistent with the joyful assertion in chap. viii. 2, "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made me free from the law of sin and of death." Throughout the epistle, to the vivid thought of St. Paul, the spiritual state he is describing is actual and present.

As Rom. v. 1, 2 stands in the Authorized Version, it is a joyful assertion of assured salvation. In the Revised Version all this is changed, and we have only an exhortation to hope and joy. The spiritual loss involved in this change is felt by all devout minds. This is especially the case with ver. 3, where the revisers' rendering, "let us also rejoice in our tribulations," is a painful descent from the Authorized Version, "we glory in tribulations also." Fortunately, as I have endeavoured to show, the Greek words found in our oldest and best copies admit another rendering, a rendering favoured by the use throughout the Greek Testament of the common construction here used. The rendering I propose leaves vers. 2 and 3 as they stand in the Authorized Version, still expressing a joyful expectation of coming glory. It thus preserves for us the most valuable element of these verses. The phrase which, in the earlier English version, asserts that *we have peace* with God, gives place to another, which exhorts us to be at peace with God, and points to justification through faith as the means by which this peace may be ours.

The transition between the exhortation of ver. 1 and the calm assurance of ver. 2b is the assertion in ver. 2a that through Christ we have obtained, and now have (Greek perfect), access into the favour of God, and the further assertion that in this grace we now stand. These confident and unmistakable assertions prepare the way for the joyful hope which follows them.

It may be objected that the rendering given above is new. But we must remember that to modern expository thought the ancient reading is new; indeed, two of the best modern commentators, Meyer and Godet, refuse to admit it. It has been recently forced upon us by the results of modern research. The ancient commentators, *e.g.*, Chrysostom, do little to elucidate the meaning of the words which they evidently accept as genuine. In such a case, we have no resource except the methods of modern grammatical exegesis.

If the above exposition be accepted, it will increase our confidence in the modern textual criticism of the New Testament. This confidence would be somewhat shaken if we were compelled to reject a reading supported by our oldest and best documents. And great would be our perplexity if we were unable to find, for a reading so well attested, an intelligible and profitable meaning. In this paper I have endeavoured to show that, accepting the words of St. Paul as given in the best copies of his epistles, we can give to them a meaning in complete harmony with the grammatical usage of the Greek Testament, with St. Paul's modes of thought, and with the argument of the epistle.

# THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

## CHRISTIAN ASCETICISM.

By REV. S. A. ALEXANDER, M.A., KEELE COLLEGE, OXFORD.

AN inquiry into the value or necessity of asceticism, like all other problems that fall within the range of the moral consciousness, is conditioned by a previous inquiry proper to the metaphysical rather than to the ethical philosopher. To decide rightly what are the true laws of the highest human well-being, and what is the loftiest and (in a very genuine sense) most natural ideal of the human spirit, and by what means that ideal is best attainable, we must first have reached at least an approximately clear decision on the larger question—What is the end of man? What place does man occupy in the world's chain of growth and development? Is he a creature *sui generis*, differentiated from other animals by the possession of a spiritual nature and by the assurance of grander destinies? or is he, in spite of his apparently unique gifts and possibilities, still one of the beasts that perish?

Amid the widest diversity of opinion on these essential problems of thought and feeling there is a fundamental agreement that the tendency and scope of conduct ought to be, and in part actually is, determined by a more or less conscious theory of the nature of man. If all man's activities and functions, however intellectual or refined, are purely animal, and limited by physical causation—like the fragrance that fades away together with the flower that gave it birth, or, to use a Platonic simile, the music that will never be heard again when the lute-strings are once broken—there is then one distinct criterion marked out for human action: the crown is awarded to the utilitarian theory of life, and the spirit of self-sacrifice which has inspired every form of asceticism forfeits its claim to be the mainspring of the soul. The higher nature, it is true, actuated by generous impulses or an enthusiasm for humanity, might still, on the one hand, prefer the pleasures of Socrates to those of the swine,<sup>1</sup> and, on the other, be willing, in seeking the greatest happiness of the greatest number, to postpone his own rights and privileges to those of others; and in this degree might admit asceticism to control his personal freedom. But such a man, as is often the case, would be better than his creed; his position would be, for himself, of doubtful consistency, and, for the world at large, impossible of attainment. To the mass of mankind it is a quite logical step from the premise "To-morrow we die" to the conclusion "Let us eat and drink to-day"; and no high-mindedness in the leader of an Epicurean school, however austere his rejection of the lower demands, can save his followers from the ultimate bathos of sensualism and self-interest. The "obscene transformation," theoretically probable, is historically certain.

<sup>1</sup> The antithesis is borrowed from J. S. Mill (*Utilitarianism*).

On the other hand, if virtue is, apart from resultant utility, an end in itself; if man has a moral nature which is not merely a modification of the physical, but a new fact in the world, bearing the impress of a Divine seal, and irradiated by higher lights than those of earth; if, above all, he draws his being from a God of wisdom and goodness, and is secure of personal immortality in Him—then, as before, the goal of duty is fixed and a plain path laid down. Let him be simply true to his own nature. Let him live as the child of God, open-eyed to whatever contributes, in thought or word or deed, to the realization of that sonship which Christianity assures to him, and strong in the repudiation of all behaviour that tends to vitiate his title-deeds, to clash with the calls of his better self, or to be out of harmony with the supreme destinies of which he is conscious. And if, for the earnest pursuance of these great ends, something akin to an ascetic habit of life be found necessary (as, in the sequel, will appear probable), let him adopt that habit without fear or reluctance; only acting, if he be truly wise, not merely or chiefly with a view to his personal development, but also with some distinct and conscious reference to larger and more social uses. The Christian, like the Epicurean, will be only following the dictates of the nature which he believes himself to possess; his morality will, in fact, be shaped according to the suggestions of his metaphysics.

For those who are inquiring into Christian asceticism, and not into asceticism generally, the metaphysical problem is beyond the need of discussion; it suffices to have remarked, very briefly, on its necessary connection with the moral standard. Christianity both implies and asserts the second of the given theories of the nature of man. It looks at man in the light of a son of God, and as the heir to a Divine kingdom in course of realization or preparation on earth, but only to be perfected in another life. It discovers the eternal elements in humanity. It proclaims that man is a citizen of two worlds, only lent by heaven to earth, and having his true citizenship above. It sees that, in a deeper sense than Aurelius divined, he is nothing but a "sojourner in a strange country." Assuming, therefore, that a man accepts this interpretation of the world and of destiny, and intends to aim at the higher life which is enshrined in the Christian ideal, we have now to ask whether asceticism is necessary or helpful to him in the race for perfection. In other words, what is the character and value of Christian asceticism? and what, if any, are its limits and dangers?

I. The word *asceticism* is not among the words which can claim an unvaried and distinct meaning. In modern times its sphere of reference has been so far confined that it is now applied only to the things of touch, of taste, and (in a lesser degree) of sight. We give the name of *ascetic* to the man who is specially distinguished for self-denial in regard to sensual pleasures of this class. But to the etymologist, asceticism (*ἀσκησις*) is a word of much larger content. It covers all actions, physical or mental, that aim at *exercise* in virtue—at the *training* by which mind and body are brought into, and maintained in, the best possible condition for the right



performance of their work; and in this, its original sense, it does not connote mortification or sacrifice. It serves rather to distinguish the practical side of the spiritual life from the theoretical—a distinction very easy to press too far, and constantly brought out in fourth century literature in the antithetic coupling of *ἀσκητής* and *φιλοσοφία*. The wider definition has at least a twofold value. In the first place, it marks the positivity which has always been a characteristic of true asceticism; and, in the next, it emphasizes the moral fact—often overlooked, and therefore of great importance—that asceticism is never more than a means to an end, never more than the crutch which helps a man to guide his faltering footsteps in the way of holiness while, concomitantly with his endeavour to perfect himself, he is attempting also to “fulfil the life-problem in human society set him by God.”<sup>1</sup> Like many other words, *asceticism* has thus undergone an undue specialization, so as to lose, in its narrowed meaning, the wide moral application of which it is properly capable. To be an ascetic it is by no means necessary to live perpetually “in sight of the death’s-head and the hour-glass,”<sup>2</sup> to withdraw oneself from society, and to lose touch with the warm movement of daily life. Such asceticism is, perhaps, only a refinement of selfishness—a whitened sepulchre covering the dry bones of enlightened self-regard. There are other and higher forms than this. A modern theologian,<sup>3</sup> in discussing the need of casuistry in ethics, has taken occasion to enumerate three classes of ascetics. The first class consists of those, if any, who deliberately believe pain to be a good, and follow it as such. Examples of this class are furnished most nearly by the Stoicism of the Roman Empire and the Monasticism of early Christianity; although, in point of fact, pain was to the Stoic rather a test of self-sufficiency than an end that was good in itself; and to the monk, primarily a means of spiritual advancement, and only secondarily, and by development, a thing of intrinsic interest and worth. Under the second head (not very clearly distinguishable from the first) are to be grouped all who submit to pain in the present world in the hope of securing happiness in the next—a large class, essentially utilitarian in spirit, and comprising members furnished by most of the historic religions. In the last division Maurice places those who are willing to surrender a lower good for the sake of a higher. He tells the story of how Napoleon, when a boy of fifteen at the military school of Paris, pleaded with the authorities for a severer training and a less luxurious style of living; and rightly attributes some part of the greatness of his after career to the spirit, thus early shown, of untameable resolution and self-control. Such asceticism—common to all who “have a work to do, and who determine that it shall be done”—must be so defined as to cover two of the distinctive traits of the man who is haunted by great ends: his comparative neglect of material pleasure and profit, and his determination to submit to any process of physical, mental, or moral hardening that may contribute to the right fulfilment of his work.

<sup>1</sup> Martensen, *Individual Ethics* (Clark), p. 404.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 421.

<sup>3</sup> F. D. Maurice, *Lectures on Casuistry*. Lect. iv.

We thus reach a preliminary hint of the underlying qualities, positive and negative, of the true Christian asceticism.

II. Although it is impossible to examine in detail within a limited space the shapes taken by what we might call the ascetic movement in the Church, yet if we hope to make any adequate estimate of its value we must attempt, however roughly, to grasp and express the character of the inspiration which gave it birth. What follows, then, on this head must be regarded, not as a *historic* survey, but simply as a *moral* estimate. The ascetic temper, in some form or other, has found a place in almost all religious systems, its earliest origin being no doubt the desire, still prevalent among savage tribes, of propitiating a hostile deity by some costly sacrifice. Starting from its cradle in the East, and passing continually Westward, it was accepted by Brahminism and Buddhism as an essential condition of the spiritual life, and incorporated, but less emphatically, by Judaism, in which its presence is marked partly, perhaps, by such institutions as fasting or the Nazarite vow, but still more clearly in the later stages of the national history by the existence of sects like the Essenes of the Dead Sea, and the Therapeutæ of Egypt. The Therapeutæ, whom we know chiefly through Philo, are described as contemplative fraternities governed by a strict rule of life; the Egyptian monks may be regarded as their lineal descendants. Even on philosophy Oriental asceticism had no little influence. The Gnostic heresies of the second century, though in the main nothing but metaphysical systems, are, for the most part, largely coloured by it in their attitude to practical life. The kindred and eclectic doctrine of Manichæism, with its theory of the inherent evil of matter, and its repugnance to all sensual pleasure, is still more distinctly an ascetic creed. Even Neo-Platonism possessed an asceticism of its own, drawn not so much from Plato as from the Oriental elements adopted into its system. On the other hand, the deeper channels of philosophic thought were left almost untouched. In spite of the suggestion that Plato brought home from his distant wanderings a tinge of the austerity of the East, a juster and wider view of the Platonic conception of the material world shows that his slight and occasional tendencies to asceticism are more than counter-balanced by his leading (and entirely Greek) theory of education as the harmonious development of all the faculties of the individual; while, from a more practical standpoint, it is clear that the life of Greece, even more than that of Rome, was always averse to the one-sided habits sanctioned by Oriental usage. In the case of the Christian Church it was partly from Judaism itself, and partly from a close contact with the original sources, that the new movement took its rise. Fasting, which very quickly assumed a prominent place in Catholic discipline, even at a time when the Church "was keenly conscious of its independence of Jewish legalism,"<sup>1</sup> was an immediate inheritance from the older dispensation; while the growing approval of celibacy, a usual though not invariable feature of asceticism, was probably derived more directly from the practice of the Essene, who, in the

<sup>1</sup> H. Sidgwick, *History of Ethics*, p. 118, note.

higher and esoteric stages of initiation, refrained altogether from marriage. This, it has been thought, was the point at which the ascetic spirit first entered Christianity.

The diversity of influences at work, combined with the difficulties of clear and exclusive definition, renders it no easy task to discern whether the ascetic movement in the Church was a development unauthorized by Christ's own teaching, or a revolutionary attempt to restore a lost perfection. The question is important because it partially includes the problem of the true character and limits of Christian self-denial. It has been asked and answered with reference not only to the orthodox monasticism, but also to condemned heresies like those of Novatian and Montanus. Did the monk possess the pure word of truth? Is Christianity so distinctly a religion of asceticism? And again: Was Montanus a heretic, or was he, with his great disciple Tertullian, a champion of the Christian faith against a degenerate age? According to one theory, the ascetic movement was thoroughly conservative. Both Monasticism and Montanism were counsels of perfection; attempts to realize for the few that high life which had been at first the ideal of all; loyal and (as Renan says of Montanism) very "natural" returns to the teaching of the Apostolic Church and to a golden era when all Christians were still living as strangers in the world, not yet assimilated with society at large or distinguished from it merely by outward forms and ceremonial, and when a Christian was never less than a saint nor schism held to be the worst of crimes. On the other side it is urged that Montanism was universally rejected by the Catholic Church, not as a dream of perfection or a refinement of holiness, but as an unorthodox addition to the requirements of the faith; that all the eloquence and energy, and even violence, of Tertullian could not save it from condemnation; and, above all, that asceticism generally, as practised and exemplified in its older and cruder forms (whether they have been recognized by the Church or not), is out of harmony with the idea of Christ, draws no authority from His own teaching or that of His disciples, and is, at least, based on mistaken interpretation of a few phrases, and on a partially distorted view of nature and natural religion.

Leaving, for the moment, the threefold appeal just indicated—to philosophy, to science, to the New Testament writings—we must proceed to a somewhat fuller characterization of the failures and qualities of the old asceticism. If it be true that the individual asceticism of hermit and eremite, shut off in deserts and lonely places from the fellowship of men, and the social asceticism of the monastic communities which, in the fourth and fifth centuries, took the place of the earlier isolation and formed centres of spiritual life, more practical in the West and more contemplative in the East, were in reality a development rather than a reaction, there is a strong temptation to believe that they were due to the tendency, common in certain stages of all religions, to lay stress on things formal and external at the expense of things spiritual and unseen. At any rate, it is to this materialism

and ritualism of the ascetic life that we must assign some part at least of the hypocrisy<sup>1</sup> and immorality which disfigure the pages of its record. The contrary tendency to complete absorption in a sphere of intense contemplation, and spiritual wrestling with invisible powers also produced fruit of a very evil kind. Closely connected as it was with an exaggerated abhorrence of the flesh and the physical world, it underrated the part played by the senses and by nature in the education of the human soul; ignored the doctrine of Christian liberty as set forth, most prominently, in the Epistles of St. Paul; and, except in the rare case of a St. Francis, gifted with a genuine and naive delight in natural beauty, was totally blind to the charm and gladness of earth and her creatures, or looked upon them only as temptations to sin. It encouraged, in its first origin, a false conception of the Christian revelation, by insisting on that belief in the nearness of Christ's second Advent to which its own existence was in part due. Its severity of abnegation was, at certain times and in certain places, carried so far that, while it undermined the health and rejected all rational modes of fasting, together with the sober and thoughtful insight that sees in fasting only a means for securing for the soul its just ascendancy over the body, and of thus harmonizing both instead of silencing the claims of one, it also degenerated rapidly into a methodical self-torture, which turned existence into an ingenious pursuit of pain; in this way embodying the error that man can merit grace, and that God takes pleasure in watching human anguish. Here we have a return to something curiously akin to the barbarism which hoped to propitiate an inhuman deity by offering him, not a broken spirit, but the sacrifice of physical torment. It is perhaps this characteristic—this lack of faith touching the free gift of life—to which, more than to any other, we must attribute the revolt of English sentiment against monastic principles and ideals, and the Protestant condemnation of "ascetic piety," on the ground that it is "unevangelical."<sup>2</sup> Further, the old asceticism was by no means perfect in its theory of moral excellence. Instead of being a positive enthusiasm for virtue, it was too often a negative avoidance of vice; instead of being inspired by a rich and active sympathy for a world of need and effort and failure, it preferred to shun the demands of men, and, with ears shut to their piteous pleadings, to hide itself in a secluded heaven of personal interests, gained by its own labours and untrodden by strange feet. Sometimes, indeed, its very earnestness turned to its own ruin and plunged it into grave spiritual disaster. In proportion to the almost savage energy with which a man sought to work out his own salvation, was the apathy with which he regarded the fate of a condemned world. The inscription that might too often have been written above the hermit's cell was that of "every man for himself"; and the spirit which ruled within its inmate's breast was the spirit of a divine selfishness. The tireless vigour with which the precepts

<sup>1</sup> There is some truth in Gibbon's sarcasm (il. 187):—"Loss of sensual pleasure was supplied and compensated by spiritual pride."

<sup>2</sup> Mark Pattison, *Sermons* (iv.).



of the Christian faith were pursued into active life grew out of a habit of literal interpretation of the sacred texts, ardent enough at times, if animated by a great and moving personality, to issue in a world-wide movement like that connected with Assisi, but more frequently falling into such depths of bathos and absurdity that edification is lost in amusement, and admiration in something very like intellectual pity. We wonder how it was that these Christian devotees failed to catch the metaphorical meaning of passages, the relativity of precepts, the provisional character of certain rules of life; that they insisted on forcibly reproducing, or attempting to reproduce, under most unfavourable conditions, the shapes and colours of mere local and temporal circumstance; that they were ignorant of the most rudimentary theory of development in practical religion, and forgetful of every distinction of letter and spirit. They appear to us almost like children—so earnest they are, so simple and confident, so full of quaint mistakes.

And yet, when all is said that the severest scrutiny or the most captious criticism can suggest, it is impossible to contemplate the lives of the old ascetics without a thrill of sympathetic emotion. Even their errors were often beautiful; and where they were right, they did an almost priceless work for the world. In spite of excesses and false theories and blind preferences of means to ends, they were still the champions of purity and faith—the saviours of Western civilization. Paganism had declared the flesh stronger than the spirit; and had made pleasure the end of life. Monasticism proved experimentally that the end of life is virtue, and that the spirit can rule the flesh. It was a magnificent protest, bizarre and distorted in expression, but still invaluable, in favour of the nobler side of man's nature; and while it appeals to us in this aspect, we cannot but feel that there is something out of place in the scornful compassion which early asceticism usually awakens in the modern mind. We recognize the historic worth of that asceticism. We perceive how in times of corruption and decay it preserved some seeds of vigorous life—and this, even while draining off from domestic and social service, and arresting in comparatively idle seclusion, much of the world's best energy and devotion. We realize that to it we ourselves are probably more indebted than we know for the strength and purity of our spiritual faith; that, if the walls of our sacred City are firm and strong, it is, in part, because their foundations were cemented with blood and watered with the dew of human tears. Like war, therefore, or slavery—those *cruces* of ethical science—asceticism has at least a relative value; it is, at its worst, part of the provisional morality by which, and out of which, the higher forms of the spiritual life have been developed. And, if we quit the comparative standard and seek for a more absolute judgment of the thing in itself, fairness will at once shut the doors on any sweeping condemnation. We may speak of it as a piece of exaggeration; but, after all, if it be such, it is an exaggeration of the good, not of the bad—not a *corruptio optimi*, but an excessive endeavour to realize what ought confessedly to be attained—not a falling short, so much as a more excusable overrunning,

of the mark—not a wilful rejection of God's gifts to men, so much as a tacit (and, it may be, not wholly untrue) recognition of the impossibility of making the best of both worlds. We may speak of it as built on a distorted view of man's nature and its right method of training; but the most ardent supporter of the Greek theory of harmonious development has always admitted, for the sake of the general good, some degree of specialization in individuals; and what were the old ascetics but specialists in the moral life, bent on the resolute rejection of the good things of earth in the hope of securing the favour of heaven? It is this spirit, this reality and fire and earnestness, that forces from us an admiration not unmixed with awe and shame. Like Spinoza or Novalis, these men were "*god-intoxicated*." They saw the ruin of the world about them, and fled for refuge into a life of solitude to escape the impending judgment of that God for whom and in whom their every hour was spent. To them the earth was a mere battlefield on which the forces of God and the Devil were for ever fighting: men and women were no more than actors in the great tragedy of sin and goodness. Their struggles were a perpetual proclamation that religion is neither an airy dream nor a casual amusement; that the Christian life is not an easy and shallow thing, that may be lightly undertaken, but a grand and infinite endeavour, calling for a man's utmost devotion and energy. It may be true that their very intensity of emotion ended in reactions; the mechanical law of action and reaction has its moral, as well as its political, analogue; and we all know too well how close together lie our lowest and our highest principles. It may be true that their very introspectiveness defeated its own ends by creating purely imaginary and subjective trials,<sup>1</sup> and by increasing the force of their temptations. And yet whatever deductions we choose to make, we cannot help finding a genuine greatness in men who passed their lives in contemplating the nature of God (as they conceived it), and the transitoriness of earthly things; who saw "the possibility of soul-culture,"<sup>2</sup> and placed it to the practice of holiness, giving up themselves wholly to God, and sometimes attaining to such sanctity that a distinction at last arose between "ordinary Christian" and "monastic" virtue; who underwent with cheerfulness any suffering rather than yield to sin; who felt that the time given to the body was "for mere necessity's sake,"<sup>3</sup> and not for self-indulgence; who helped to create the virtues of purity and simplicity; and whose fine enthusiasm and earnestness of life did so much to spread the spirit of self-sacrifice and to propagate the Christian faith. Even the poor, tortured, deluded Stylites, lifted up in exposure to sun and frost and storm, has a pathetic and solitary grandeur that cannot be overlooked; and as he stands there erect on his lofty pillar,

"A sign betwixt the meadow and the cloud,"<sup>4</sup>

we see in him a sublime testimony to the spirituality of the soul of man.

(To be concluded.)

<sup>1</sup> This seems to be the explanation of the Visions of Monastic history.

<sup>2</sup> Mark Pattison, *Sermons* (iv.).

<sup>3</sup> Athanasius, *Life of Antony*.

<sup>4</sup> Tennyson, *Simeon Stylites*.

## EARLY CONTACT OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH WITH THE ROMAN WORLD.

N<sup>o</sup> IV.—CYPRUS AND PISIDIA.

A MIGHTIER MAGIC AND A NOVEL PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY.

By REV. PROFESSOR H. R. REYNOLDS, D.D.

WHILE the Antiochenes, according to their wont, were amusing themselves harmlessly with the creation of a new nickname for the movement which threatened the order of their beautiful city, Jerusalem was in the throes of a struggle with the loathsome madman who was wielding the destinies and forces of the empire. The terrible threat to introduce a colossal image of himself as the NUMEN of the Temple of Herod, led to such a manifestation of inflexible fidelity to the sublime truth of the Hebrew creed, that, for a while, this blasphemous proceeding was arrested. To what extent the Jerusalem Church sympathized with the chiefs of their nation in resisting this bitter humiliation we do not know. Seeing, however, the constituency of the Church, and that a company of priests became obedient to the faith, and noting the fervency of the Christian adherence to the prime truth of the unity of God, it is more than probable that the disciples of Jesus took their part in the struggle and aided the passionate and prolonged resistance to the imperial edict. By this is meant that they helped to accentuate and hurry forward the movement which ultimately terminated the national existence. At all events, while Caligula was with insatiable vanity pursuing this special spite against the Jewish people, they had no heart and no special inducement to persecute the disciples of Jesus. A momentary pause in the agony supervened, and the new society developed its forces, and organized its representatives, working for a while along identical lines with the bulk of the nation. The Apostles themselves had not departed from Jerusalem.

The story of the "Legatio ad Caesarem" must also have been heard in the bazaars, synagogues, and palaces of Antioch, and many of the solemn forecasts of prophetic men took their tone from the wild freaks of the imperial madman. The death of Caligula and the advent of Claudius tended to augment every existing tendency in Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. The name of "Christian" was never adopted by St. Paul. Herod Agrippa II. used the term with ill-concealed scorn (Acts xxvi. 28), and when St. Peter, in 1 Peter iv. 16 made use of it, the phrase "suffer as a Christian" implied that it was still an accusation rather than a well-accepted epithet. The Jews, for the reason that the term represented a fusion with themselves which they hated, preferred the designation "Nazarene" or "Galilean." This was the term said to have been adopted on a memorable occasion by the Emperor Julian.

It is not our intention to pursue the story of the Church from *within*, but to endeavour to represent the advent of its various features, as they broke upon the Roman world. Strangely perverted by rumour or utterly ignored, Christianity was confounded with Jewish pride and prejudice, or with

Oriental superstition. Some of its real essence and veritable mission must, nevertheless, have slowly become the talk of the court and the camp, and stirred the stagnant pools of feulence and ignominy which degraded all the centres of power and civilization.

When Herod Agrippa I. received the title of King of the Jews, though he had been the favourite of Caligula, and was possibly mixed up with some of the monstrous devices of his imperial patron, he felt that he must conform to the prejudices and policy of his new subjects, and pretended a special predilection for the customs and observances of the High Church party at Jerusalem.

In these moments of comparative peace, and when the dominant Hellenists of Antioch had almost overpowered and quite outnumbered the Jews who had partially accepted the new title of *Christian*, Herod projected a sharp outbreak of mischievous wrath against the disciples of the Lord. Almost as a bolt out of the blue sky, he had "killed" one of the sons of Zebedee, "James the brother of John with the sword." What it was that gave to James this pre-eminence we may conjecture from the few hints supplied by the synoptic narrative of the fiery intensity of the Boanerges. To the mothers of our Lord and of the Apostle John this martyrdom must have recalled the awful tragedy of earlier days, and the whole of the poverty-stricken society of the metropolis must have been smitten with fear. The foiled intention of Herod to seize and slay the most conspicuous of the twelve Apostles was so closely associated with the blasphemous flattery offered to the king and with his subsequent death, that for a while the restless thirst for vengeance was allayed, and the Roman governor, Cuspius Fadus, if he troubled himself at all with the new movement, might have heard that the famine-struck Nazarenes in Judæa were being aided by the generous contributions of the "Christians" at Antioch. The energy of a new moral force may have arrested his attention, for such benevolences were not too common, so that the phenomenon may have startled him as a novel sign of the times. The liberality and mutual sacrifice of Christians a hundred years later gave edge to the satire of Lucian in his *De morte Peregrini*. Mere sentimental love to man as man is often now the theme of bitter reproach; but when it takes the practical form of self-denial and substantial charity, even the world of to-day admits it to be a "great fact" that has henceforth to be reckoned with. Not only did the wealthy Jews of Antioch make contribution for the poor saints at Jerusalem (as Queen Helena of Adiabene and her son Izates were doing for the sufferers in Judæa during the reign of Claudius), but the "disciples"—Greek and Roman, Tarsian and Cypriote, soldiers of the empire and converted publicans—had been moved with compassion over the depressed condition of the so-called *ecclesia* of the metropolis.

But the organization of the empire was touched by the strange effect produced upon a distinguished proconsul of the island of Cyprus by two strangers who arrived there in the year A.D. 44, in the fifth year of Claudius.

Barnabas and Saul of Tarsus had been the centre of a group of prophetic



men who were directing the activities of the Church at Antioch. Having recently returned from Jerusalem on their mission of benevolence, and tasted the bitterness of the hatred still cherished by the chief representatives of Jewish opinion, their hearts must have yearned to carry the message of life to the "regions beyond." They saw visions, they dreamed dreams. Their love to and yearning over their own people may even then have been intense enough to make them ready to go to prison with Peter or to the scaffold with James, to suffer the loudest and most sweeping anathema, nay, to be "accursed by Christ" Himself for their brethren's sakes, yet they were prepared with more burning fervour still to make known the Person and Word of the Lord to the heathen of the West. Barnabas was a Cypriote, and a Levite, Saul was a Hebrew of Hebrews, and a free-born citizen of Rome, and they must have foreseen that which awaited them if they attempted a propaganda of their faith in the Jew-haunted island of Cyprus, in the cities of the sea-board of Pamphylia, or in the great plateau beyond the passes of the Taurus. Nevertheless, the hand of the Lord was upon them. A strange passion to reveal the open secret forced them on. They had felt the common emotion of the Spiritual Brotherhood in Antioch. A voice which was to them nothing short of that which had led Elijah to show himself to Ahab, or Daniel to confront all the power of Babylon and Persia, or Jeremiah to deliver messages of stern rebuke to the kings and princes of Judah had been heard, and this voice separated them to a special work. They were driven forth of the Spirit to a fierce and fiery temptation, to a work of surpassing difficulty, and one demanding heroic courage and profound conviction. They carried with them the electric thrill which had been communicated to them in the fellowship of believers and brethren of which they became the representatives. No more momentous journey had ever been undertaken by mortal men if we estimate it by its ultimate results. It was the true beginning of the great missionary enthusiasm which has done so much to create the modern world. It was a movement of souls dilated with the sublime hope of shaping the eternal destinies of mankind. It was the beginning also of the long series of agonies by which the work was done. Disappointment, sickness, murderous mobs, physical sufferings, heartrending sorrows, harassed almost every step of the journey.

Barnabas was not only a native of Cyprus, but must have known and participated in the early efforts to diffuse the good tidings in the island, and can scarcely have been ignorant of the zest with which the early converts had begun to preach the Word to Greeks as well as Jews. While Peter was led by vision and heavenly voices to include the Græco-Roman officials of Cæsarea in the society of the early Church, and even to open wide the door of faith to the Gentiles, this spontaneous movement had independently taken place at Antioch, and had been the occasion of the extraordinary accession to the Church which led Barnabas and Saul to the present enterprise.

They landed first of all at the eastern extremity of the island, at what was then called *Salamis*, and for unknown reasons pressed forward through

the mixed population of Egyptians and Cyrenians, of Greeks and Jews, until they reached Neo-Paphos, near the site of the famous and infamous shrine of Aphrodite, and the seat of the Roman Proconsul Sergius Paulus. They found this nobleman ready to listen to their word. Like many another Roman, both sceptical and cynical, he had sought to draw some consolation from the random visits of the wandering *Magi*, Jewish or Oriental, who had grown rich on the credulity of their dupes. It would seem more than probable that Citium in Cyprus was the birthplace of that chief of sorcerers, Simon, whose ideas, whose wild theosophy, whose excitable nature, whose deadly animosity to the faith, casts a deep shadow over the earliest records of Christian history and literature. Elymas or Bar-Jesus was a frequenter of the court of Sergius Paulus, one perhaps of many who, by thaumaturgic arts and pretence of mystery had tried to unroll the book of fate. The secret guilds of these necromancers made popular use of the ancient magical formulæ and ritual which had come down from ancient Assyrian literature. The dignity of these old secrets lent some tinge of respectability to their adepts, Half-physicians, half-wizards, professors of an antique philosophy, and a knowledge of the occult forces of nature, these men were pressed by the universal need for some intelligence issuing from behind the veil of sense transcending reason, some way of securing a surer indication of the purposes of heaven with reference to the issues of life and death. This passion cannot in its origin have been ignoble. Divination is as old as religion. The eager search after some resting-place beyond the sphere of the visible universe has been a constant stimulus of religious observance and theosophic speculation. Not only were *Eastern* faiths upheld by diviners, prognosticators, searchers into the book of fate, but from early times the Etruscans and the Latins had believed that by auguries and sacrifices, by astrological prevision and necromancy, they could unroll the future. The prophets of the Hebrew people had been always confronted by the ranks of these eager rivals of their own claims. They were haunted, and sometimes foiled, by divination, by weird symbols, and the loud proclamations of those who sought to achieve political ends or religious devices of their own. The credulity of men has provoked the false prophet to profess a deeper knowledge than he possessed. The bare assumption that he knew the will of God tempted him to imposture and chicanery, to fresh vaticinations, and to novel methods of compelling confidence. Nor has the practice ever died out, even in the West. A fringe of spiritualists, of those that "peep and mutter" over the dead, of those who profess "second sight," who have secrets to tell to the initiated, has hovered round not only the advancing armies of Christian light, but has even beset the pathway of the scientific students of nature. A full sketch of the history of divination would bring him who could write it face to face with every phase and development of society in every generation and country of Christendom. It is a far cry from Simon of Citium to Montanus, from Montanus to the prophets of Zwickau, from Peregrinus to Paracelsus, from the mysteries of Eleusis to modern theosophy;

yet it is of deep interest to observe that, from the beginnings of Christianity to modern spiritualism, the word of the Lord—the message and secret of Jesus—has challenged the oracles, has overturned the tripod, has burned the instruments of magic and books of the dead; by fair and sometimes by evil methods has cast out the crafts of the witch, and driven the diviner mad. And, strange to say, the thing has been done, and the victory has been won by the demonstrations of a higher Spirit, by the utterance of an "open secret," by verily rolling back the door of heaven, by a self-evidencing revelation. "That which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, that which hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive, God has revealed unto men by His Spirit." Consequently, what one might expect, and that which is reported as most credibly true and historic, is that one of the first impressions upon the Græco-Roman world was the conviction wrought in the mind of a man of affairs, the governor of a senatorial province, that a veritable revelation had occurred which could and would satisfy minds that were hungering and panting after a deeper knowledge of unseen things, of Divine purposes, of the future destiny of individuals, of nations, and of the world.

Archdeacon Farrar suggests that the apparent interest in Bar-Jesus on the part of Sergius Paulus was no sign of his weakness or of any lack of intelligence, that Rome was a centre where men of this class congregated, that Marius had trusted the prognostic help of the Jewish Martha, that Tiberius was surrounded, according to Juvenal, "with a herd of Chaldeans on the rock of Capri," and that Pliny (H. N. xxx. 2, 6) has given an account of two schools of soothsayers at Paphos, to one of which this Bar-Jesus, this Elymas, may well have belonged.

When Sergius Paulus heard of the arrival of the missionaries at Paphos he courted their instructions, and conviction was flashed upon his mind. The spells of the sorcerer were unwound, the enchantment vanished, the vision of God was conveyed to his own inner intelligence. He caught the mighty secret. He believed, and the court favourite was roused to retaliate and to put forth all his power to undo the effect of the teaching of Barnabas and Saul. This was a moment of typical character in the history of the Church of God. The holy wrath of Saul (who is also called Paul) flamed up in a vigorous outburst, as he saw efforts made to shut the golden gate, and to turn away the proconsul from the faith. The issue was that the prediction of Paul was verified. The sorcerer fell into a swoon of darkness, and was led away blinded from the presence of his master. When Sergius Paulus saw what had happened, he believed, being overwhelmed at the teaching concerning the Lord.

Again and again the like scenes occurred at Ephesus and Philippi. The heathen world of Eastern Europe was touched, and in many respects convinced, that as the secret of the Lord became known to men the whole army of conjurors, tricksters, traffickers with mysteries, nay, even the hierophants of tremendous initiation, and the merchants who grew rich upon these impostures, was broken up, and often with wild imprecations of

vengeance. The same conflict has occurred in many forms, and a thousand times, since that day. When the Emperor Julian, during his brief but marvellous occupancy of the throne of Constantine, endeavoured to rehabilitate the "mysteries" and to renew the revolting rites of the ancient worship, and even to invest the heathen hierarchy with some of the garments and functions of the Christian Presbyter, the failure was absolute. "The Galilean conquered." The veil of the temple of Jehovah had been rent in twain, and the veil of Isis too; the cloud that rested upon the grave had been lifted; the mighty magic of the Cross, notwithstanding all the attraction of the prince of this world, was drawing all men to Jesus. Doubtless the Christian faith must have assumed the character of a species of mysticism, and been unintelligible to those who took no heed of its promises, and made no serious attempt to understand the breadth of its revelations, or to accept its blending of mercy and judgment, or to credit the historic facts by which the height and depth of the love of God had been guaranteed. That could only come with time. Roman society from end to end felt that another superstition had been added to the crude and beguiling follies which afflicted it. Its very origin discounted its value, but the rumour that it was spreading like wild-fire in the great cities of Antioch, Alexandria, and Ephesus, and still further was leading to outbreak in the metropolis of the world, is well authenticated in the pages of Roman historians.

Like all great revelations of unseen realities, it has run the career incident to human nature. On the one hand, it has itself put on the character of a dangerous and perhaps licentious fanaticism; it has assumed a knowledge which it could not sustain; it has gathered into its train, like a gigantic comet, other meteoric and similar materials, illusions as well as indubitable facts, and has led to strange Gnostic speculation and magical practices, which in their licence and extravagance have rushed to their own ruin as well as to the defamation of Christianity. On the other hand, the Divine revelation has been stereotyped, or crystallized into form and ceremony, into hard dogmatisms or vulgar hierarchical claims, so that through the entire history of Christianity the grand elements of the revelation given in Christ could only reassert themselves in mighty movements of irresistible conviction, resembling the superb outbursts of enthusiasm which for a while swept over the communities of Jerusalem and Antioch.

As previously stated, the present series of meditations is no attempt to produce an historical sketch of the progress of the new movement through the provinces of the Roman Empire, or of the growth of Christian doctrine, or the development of the Christian Church, but rather to look at the character which these tendencies assumed in their earliest stages as viewed from without and by Græco-Roman society.

The interesting historical and geographical questions raised by M. Renan, and more recently by Prof. Ramsay, touching the real site of the Galatian Churches, whose petulant and fickle character led to one of the



most notable and authentic documents of the Christian faith, must be left on one side for the present. All Biblical students eagerly await the publication of Prof. Ramsay's forthcoming work.

If the first missionary journey of St. Paul, as described in Acts xiii. and xiv., represents the founding of the Galatian Churches, a fresh gleam of light is thrown upon a considerable portion of the New Testament. So far, the transference of St. Paul's zeal from Cyprus to the great plateau beyond the Taurus range seems to fit with startling propriety sundry references in the four great Epistles of the Apostle of the Gentiles. The visits to Antioch, Lystra, and Derbe, with their dramatic incidents and their revelations of apostolic wisdom, fervour, and courage, brought into view a schism between two sections of those who were alike ready at first to accept St. Paul's interpretation of the old covenant. But the Jews who were prepared to admit the Messiahship of the Lord Jesus "contradicted and blasphemed" the position that a Messianic benediction could be offered freely to the world at large, independently of ceremonial rite or devotion to the national ideal of the Jew. The conflict produced very notable effects on the Christian society, dominated the movements of the Apostles, and produced tendencies which reveal themselves in sub-apostolic literature.

Many efforts have been made by modern critics to transfer the sentiments of the second century, as displayed in the Clementine literature, back into the first century, and to account for the records of the activity of Paul, Peter, James, and John, on the supposition of the rooted antagonism of feeling that divided the great Apostles from one another. It has been supposed that some of the most valuable documents of the New Testament—the Acts, the later Epistles of Paul—were written in the close of the second century in order to hush up, ignore, and hide the antagonism that had divided Paul and the Jerusalem Apostles, but which at last had been subdued; and that the Johannine literature was a final effort to represent the inner union of the contending factions in a mystical philosophy and a Catholic Church. In my opinion, the supposed contrast between the three Apostles is misleading, and that Paul was as deeply rooted a Hebrew as either Peter or John, and even more of a mystic than the beloved Apostle.

I do not profess in this place to handle the controversy, nor to adduce the strong reasons that exist for believing that St. John's contribution to the literature of Christianity dates from a far earlier period than is compatible with the theory of the Tübingen schools. Nor will it be necessary to defend the general trustworthiness of the historical details of "the Acts." Let us rather observe how the Roman world, step by step, was compelled to recognize a new fact and a potent influence which it could not bend to its will. We see that Roman governors minimized for a time the whole contest between Jews and Christians, as well as between Jewish and Gentile believers, as turning upon a difference of opinion about what was supposed to be a very petty matter of fact, *e.g.*, that Paul affirmed to be alive a Man whom his enemies averred had been crucified.

No great matter or movement could, as they thought, emerge out of a craze of that description, and frequently the Roman authorities threw the shield of imperial protection over the advocate of such a harmless puerility. But the gist and pith of Paul's teaching in Pisidia, one which led to violent commotion and perilous positions for this unwelcome stranger, but whom they, the magistrates, must in the end have protected from further insult, was nothing less than a new philosophy of history and a new conception of the Godhead. Some of the following notions must (perhaps in a perverted form) have been discussed in the busy centres of the commercial, military, and civil activity of these prosperous highlands.

1. That the Godhead was living and beneficent, universal and one, the Source of all things, the Giver of all good; that all nature contained the signs of His presence; and that the daily and yearly routine of light and shadow, winter and summer, dearth and fruitful seasons, were continuous witness of His wise and gracious Providence. These were positions which would make a favourable impression upon the governing classes, and might be referred by them to the higher teaching of the philosophic schools. But when on the faith of such fundamental ideas the strangers did not scruple to denounce the sacrificial worship of the popular mythology and all idolatrous practices, even though it might have resulted in great gain and reputation and respect to themselves, the presence of a new power betrayed itself. Even the stoning of the unknown prophets was rather a welcome diversion, likely to strike as they hoped a little sense and expediency into their Jewish zealotry. From their standpoint, the new school, or clique of strangers, was making the Jewish quarter of the cities more than usually objectionable, and raising in the minds of the authorities a fear lest a propaganda of iconoclastic ideas and practices might arise which would give serious trouble and anxiety to those who had the responsibility of keeping the peace. Novelty in the presentation of fundamental ideas of God is the harbinger of social changes, and often the pioneer of political insubordination. As long as ideas resembling the philosophical opinions of certain sections of Græco-Roman society were simply national and tribal in their range, as long as *Henotheism* was a Hebrew badge, it was allowed to pursue its course unchecked; but when a pure monotheism, the oneness or solity, the righteousness and power of the Eternal, was preached to subjects of the empire as the basis of all ethic, and the ground of all hope, to Greek and Lycaonian, to Celt and Roman, carrying with it the repudiation of ancient traditions and immemorial custom, alarm took the place of indifference, and inquiry and legislation, or cruel edicts, were sure to follow. The temple worship, the profitable guilds, and traffic were at stake; a new power was honeycombing society, and a certain obvious criticism played over the face of the populace, now emancipated from time-honoured superstitions, as they watched the Prætor or Proconsul patronize an idolatrous *fête*. It was not unnatural that the teachings and the teachers of this brotherhood should be carefully watched, and that they should be spoken of in Macedonia as men who were turning the world upside down.

2. This, however, was not the whole of the novelty. On several occasions the most prominent advocates of the new faith were propounding a *new philosophy* or rationale not only of the daily routine of nature, but of the entire *procession of history*. The great historians from Herodotus and Thucydides to Livy and Tacitus set forth the succession of historic events in the form of a natural evolution of political or constitutional changes, or a series of surprises and disappointments, or a posy of charming anecdotes, or an impeachment of depraved but sovereign masters of the world, or a sketch of the inexplicable conflict between the immortal powers whose contradictory caprices were imaged in human affairs and national destinies. It would be easy to cull from the current historical literature a masterly exposure of incompetence and blind folly, pathetic climaxes of vanity and presumption ending in catastrophe, or cunning and bravery overcoming terrible odds; and more than this, old legends of the prehistoric ages had been dressed up in sumptuous poetry and with consummate art to indicate the haunting consequences of sin, and trace the blending of supernatural fate with the free-will of man, forcing upon a doomed family not only punishment, but the grim necessity of committing the very sins which called for tragic doom. But the entire historic sense must have been stirred by the intense conviction shared amongst the first preachers of the new faith, that the succession of events through a lengthened past was one continuous preparation of an elect people to receive the most transcendent privilege and sublime heritage, and to offer it to the world at large. Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, as Stephen before the Council, and as Peter on the day of Pentecost and other occasions, claimed with convincing power to prove that the history of Israel was the womb in which was carried the destiny of all the nations; that the transcendental facts of which they were witnesses were the foreseen and culminating goal not only of their own national career, but of all history and all people; that prophetic men always fell victims to their own call and to their own commerce with the infinite, and were but partially understood, but that through all the stiff-neckedness and the calamities of the sacred race the same advancing plan of the Eternal had emerged more and more into view, until the deepest tragedy of all had become not only a message of mercy to them, but the provision for all men of a salvation from sin and death.

The very lesson which they pressed first upon the Jew and then upon the Roman was a word meant for every individual of the human race. It could not escape the keen intelligence of the governing classes of Rome in its provinces that while the pressure of Roman conquest, and the construction of the outlying and subsidized principedoms, brought their anticipation up to the dead blank wall of a world-wide organization, it could not penetrate for one moment into the future of this huge order of things, and that it took the very smallest account of the individual, and had no faith whatever about such future: yet that in these new voices was a recognition of the future of each soul. They must have heard that the true explanation even of the early conflicts between the Hellenes and the Persians, between the

kingdoms into which the dominions of Alexander had broken up, and between Rome and her province of Judæa had all been anticipated, and were hurrying on the crisis of the world's history, a new heaven and a new earth. They must have found it to be a matter of faith that the goal of the entire history, even of Rome itself, and that the destiny of all nations had converged upon an event which had rolled back the heavy curtains of this world's fate, and was diffusing itself as a new source of joy and fellowship. This linking of the generations; this supposed fulfilment of often-repeated promises; this interpretation, not only of Solomon's temple, but that of Zeus, of Artemis, and of Pallas-Athene; this meaning, now first given to the functions of all kingly, prophetic, and priestly men, was doubtless in their opinion the wildest dream and, for a time, a preposterous superstition; but, nevertheless, wherever it travelled, it laid hold of susceptible minds, of cultivated women, of "holy and humble men of heart." At all events, we cannot be far wrong in the conclusion that such an effect upon Græco-Roman minds must have been one of the earliest impressions which the world received concerning the new faith. Men and women said to each other, Here, at least, is a plausible solution of the riddle of the past; here is the *dénouement* for which we and our fathers have been striving; here is the end of one vast æon of humanity, and the absolute beginning of a new world. Birth is an agony and a fear to the travailing woman. So great a transition of thought from the womb of the past to the free life of the future is often accompanied with the blended cry of both the mother and her child; but when the cry of pain is over, both can exult—each will forget the anguish in the deeper joy.

In this nineteenth century there has been a frequent flutter when some audacious theory of the universe has been proposed which has threatened to make itself the goal and the summation of all previous attempts to unriddle the mysteries of thought and civilization. The pompous claim of Auguste Comte to have linked all facts and laws of nature, all the progress of allied and successive civilizations, religions and philosophies, all races of men, all great tendencies of mankind by one evolutionary method into the construction of a humanity conscious of itself, and supplying to all the individuals of which it was composed a sufficient object of worship and a real organon of society, with Paris as its metropolis, and himself as the founder of the absolute religion, created a sensible disturbance in the *salons* of Paris, Berlin, and London. Its audacity, its comprehensiveness, its subtle utilization of the past, its prophecies of the future, held many fine minds captive, and led superior persons in the chief centres of European thought to watch the progress of the speculation "with bated breath."

That huge speculation has vanished into the mystic shadows where the Republic of Plato, the New Atlantis, the Leviathan of Hobbes, the New Jerusalem of Swedenborg, and a thousand other dreams faintly contend for the mastery; but the conception of the end of history, and the meaning of its successive stages, and its stupendous appeal to the individual conscience, with its superb constructive power and organizing force, its beneficent



influence upon all sorts and conditions of men has outlived Roman imperial system, Grecian wisdom, poetry, and art, has survived the most stupendous changes brought about by science and art, war and culture, feudalism and the Revolution, and, spite of the spasms of hatred and ecstasies of scorn, does at this moment hold in its hand the keys of both worlds.

## CURRENT AMERICAN THOUGHT.

THE FEDERAL HUMANITY AND UNIVERSAL MEDIATION OF THE CHRIST. By Rev. WM. RUPP, D.D. (*The Reformed Quarterly Review*).—The manhood of the Christ, which is the medium of all Divine activity among men, is not merely that of a particular man among others of his kind. He is the central, the universal man, the Second or Last Adam, in whom the human race has its real bond of union. "The human race is not merely a mass of disconnected individuals, but an organism of which Christ is the all-embracing, all-sustaining centre." But Christ is not only the head and crown of humanity, He is also, in one sense, its beginning. The end of any organic process, whether it be in nature or history, must always be regarded as the organic and controlling idea of the process; just as the workman's conception of the end to be accomplished is the directing idea of the work which he performs. If humanity be more than the mere chance-product of the blind self-evolution of an unconscious world-process, then we must recognize in the unfolding life of humanity the presence of a great governing vitalizing idea; and this is the idea of the Christ. We cannot conceive it as ever a mere abstraction of the Divine mind. Divine ideas are always realities, and the creative, organic idea in humanity—the idea which lies at the root of every man's being, determining both his own peculiar nature and his relations to the whole, must be an essential form or subsistence of the Divine personality itself, or, in other words, a Divine person; and this Divine person is the Eternal Christ, the Logos of St. John's Gospel; of the thought of which the *Sophia* of the books of Proverbs and of Wisdom was a vague anticipation and prophecy.

According to St. John, the Logos, who is God, and yet distinct from God, is the medium of every Divine creation. To men He stands not merely in the relation of creator and life-giver, but also in that of illuminator. "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." The light shining in reason and conscience. The early fathers held that the heathen, even in pre-Christian times, were in some real way related to Christ. But if we grant that all men, of all times and places, stand in some relation to the eternal creative Logos, does this imply that they are in any essential relation to Christ, the incarnate Logos? The answer depends on our conception of the relation between the eternal Divine Logos and the man Christ Jesus. Is this relation eternal and necessary, or temporary and accidental? The Word became flesh, but does this imply that He became something essentially other than He was before? God cannot become anything for which there is no aptitude or pre-determination in His eternal being. When the Logos becomes man, He does not become anything that previously was foreign to His nature. The state of being man must be an eternal disposition or mode of being in the Divine Logos. "Godhood and manhood are not contradictory entities mutually incompatible, and capable of exist-

ing only side by side with each other, but they must be conceived as ideally and essentially one in the constitution of the Eternal Logos, who in the fulness of time became incarnate and was made man. And this becoming incarnate was a *temporal* act only as viewed from our present human standpoint. As viewed from the Divine standpoint it is an *eternal* act—an act that is wholly above and apart from time. The historical human Christ is but the temporal manifestation of an eternal ideal Christ.

The conception of the eternal ideal humanity of Christ helps to explain the constitution of Christ's Person, and the relation to each other of the attributes of the Divine and human natures which co-exist in Him. The difficulty in the doctrine of the Incarnation is to hold fast the idea of the unity of person along with that of the duality of natures. This difficulty theologians have sought to remove by asserting the impersonality of Christ's human nature. But personality is necessary to the integrity of human nature; and an impersonal human nature would be human nature devoid of its most distinguishing characteristic. Still, the question may be asked, What is it that makes the human individual a person? "It is the personality of the creative Divine Logos, by whose action in humanity, conditioned by the natural process of generation, a physico-psychical basis is produced, out of which the proper human self or person, with all its mental and moral qualities, raises itself by its own spontaneous effort. The developed personality can contain no more than is originally involved, in the way of potentiality, in the physico-psychical basis or germ; and that germ cannot have its origin in impersonal matter, or in nothing (*nikhilo*), but only in the life of the personal creative Logos. The Logos, therefore, is in a most real sense the root of every human person; and every human person is, consequently a relative manifestation, or resounding (*personare*) of the creative Logos in human nature."

"Through an extraordinary creative agency of the Divine Logos at a certain point in the life of humanity, a physico-psychical being is produced, from which there arises a personality that is progressively one with the personality of the Logos. This is the personality of Jesus, who, therefore, is the Son of God in a pre-eminent sense that applies to Him alone." The conception of the oneness of the real Christ with the eternal or ideal Christ in the Divine being enables us to understand the relation to each other of the attributes of the Divine and human natures in His person. If the human nature which the Logos assumed was something absolutely foreign to the nature in which He existed before, it is impossible to conceive of the Incarnation without doing violence to either nature concerned. But the two natures as united in Christ are homogeneous. The author endeavours to support this view by passages from the Pauline epistles.

If the idea of Christ is an eternal predetermination in the Divine essence, of which the historical Christ is but the temporal manifestation, then this manifestation could not have been conditioned as a reality by any accidental circumstance in the history of the world. The Incarnation was not called for simply by the fact of sin; it has its ground of necessity in the essential nature of God, and in the essential nature of the world as determined by the eternal will of God. Quite apart from sin, the Man Christ Jesus is the Mediator between God and men. All men are constitutionally related to God in Christ, and without Christ they sustain no relation to God at all. The idea of universal headship is distinctly implied in the designation of Him as the Last Adam.

But has not this constitutional relation of humanity to Christ been dissolved by the occurrence of sin? It is held by some that the Adamic race is totally sundered

from God, totally depraved, totally dead in sin, the object of Divine wrath, and under sentence of eternal damnation. Christ as Last Adam is the head of a new race, which consists of some of the old race reborn and recreated. This Augustinian view is now happily left behind by the more advanced Christological theology of to-day. This makes Christ central in the actual constitution of humanity. It affirms that men's essential relation to the Christ is original, constitutional, and permanent. This relation could be disturbed and obscured by the entrance of sin; but it could not be annihilated without annihilating man himself. There is in man a perverse moral tendency, but there are limits to it, and counteracting tendencies, manifesting the presence of an incorruptible moral power. There is a sense of God in all men; it is the light of the eternal Christ shining in the darkness, and shining in spite of the tendency of that darkness to suppress it. Pelagius was right when he asserted that there is in man some real moral ability, some ability for good; but he was wrong in supposing that this moral ability resides in human nature considered apart from its constitutional relation to God in Christ. The doctrine of a limited atonement is the most natural outcome of this Christless conception of humanity. Those theologians have not been mistaken who, like Clement of Alexandria and Origen in ancient, and Erskine, Robertson, and Maurice in modern times, have emphasized the idea of an indissoluble essential relation of all men to God in Christ—a relation obscured indeed, but not broken by sin, and involving in itself the possibility and principle of salvation from sin. Man as man is the child of God, and this relationship holds in and through the eternal Christ.

The realization of the possibilities involved in the Divine constitution of a human being is not a spontaneous or natural, but a moral and spiritual process. In order to become Christian it is necessary that the soul should come into a direct moral or personal relation to Christ; and in order to this it is required that the Christ be presented outwardly by means of the Gospel, and inwardly through the Spirit. Christ's essential mediation must become a mediation in the Spirit, and the essential relation between Him and the soul must be transformed into a spiritual relation. The Holy Spirit is the medium through which the saving life-giving energy of Christ is brought to bear upon the spirit of man, in order to the subjective realization of the objective redemption of humanity in Christ.

The Spirit is the principle of self-consciousness, in God as well as in man—the principle of actual personality. Spirit in general may be defined as the identity of subject and object, or of thought and existence. God is revealed to Himself in the Spirit. In the Logos the Divine essence objectifies, images, and expresses itself; in the Spirit the same essence apperceives itself, looks through itself in that objective image, and thus knows itself. These three factors in the eternal essence of God—subject, object, and identity of both—are three distinct subsistences, and are named in theology Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Spirit is also the revealer of God to all other selves outside of God, but He acts in union with the other subsistences in the Godhead. "For these subsistences are not three Gods, but three determinations or modes of one Divine Being." The complete activity of the Holy Spirit became possible only after the ethical completion of the person of Christ, or after the complete historical expression of the Divine Being and character in human nature. The Spirit could only come after Christ was glorified.

But man is the image of God, and there was in humanity from the beginning an essential expression of the Eternal Word; and in so far there was the possibility also of a revealing, completing, perfecting activity of the Holy Spirit among men. Essentially and potentially Christ was in humanity from the beginning, and the

formal actualization of life-germs in nature came to pass through the agency of the Holy Spirit. Christ was conceived by the Holy Spirit; He was filled with the Spirit; He offered Himself in the Eternal Spirit; and, having been put to death, He was quickened in the Spirit. And now, the moral realization of the Christ in the individual human soul, that is, the appropriation of His character by means of personal union with Him, is brought to pass likewise through the agency of the Holy Spirit. Salvation means essentially the realization of moral likeness to God, or the actualization of the Divine image in the human soul. And for this men must become spiritually related to Christ.

Those are in error who hold that the presence of the essential Christ in human nature, and the universal activity of the Holy Spirit, are sufficient for salvation, even without the testimony of the Gospel. If the simple fact of the universal immanence of Christ in humanity, as the cause of the light shining in reason and conscience, were sufficient for the salvation of individuals now, then it would seem that it should have been sufficient also for the same purpose previous to the actual occurrence of the Incarnation; or else we must assume some presentation of Christ to the acceptance of every man before his doom is finally fixed.

The Church is the sphere in which Christ in the Spirit now exercises His mediatorial office among men for their salvation. The author thus describes the work of the Spirit as we can now recognize and trace it. "By an impact of the Spirit of Christ upon the soul, at the essential centre of its being, back of all consciousness, it is quickened into that spiritual life which its original constitution in Christ properly implied and demands. It is only this touch of the Spirit of Christ that brings out the soul's true nature, and without this it can, therefore, never be truly itself. In developing a Christian personality it unfolds itself according to its original idea and constitution in Christ.

SAUL'S EXPERIENCE ON THE WAY TO DAMASCUS. BY Prof. ERNEST D. BURTON, Univ. of Chicago (*The Biblical World*).—Whatever may have been the actual facts of this incident, Saul ever afterward believed that at this time he received indubitable evidence that Jesus of Nazareth had risen from the dead. To understand the nature of the change wrought in Saul by this experience, we must understand what sort of a man Saul was before he passed through it. 1. He was a man of profound moral earnestness. He was always intense. Earnestness did not begin with his conversion. 2. He was an earnest seeker after righteousness. "It would seem as if our Lord's blessing on those who hunger and thirst after righteousness could have been pronounced on Saul before his conversion." 3. The method by which he sought to attain righteousness was a strict obedience to the law as interpreted by the Pharisees. By his expression "righteousness which is in the law," Paul means not merely a righteousness which realizes the law's ideal, but something both more and less than that, viz., a righteousness which is attained, so far as attained at all, by a self-reliant effort to obey the law. Law stands in Paul's vocabulary for that method of life according to which a man sets before himself what he conceives to be the demands of God, and gives himself to the endeavour to attain right character, and so to earn Divine approval as a thing deserved at God's hand. Righteousness thus acquired, and in so far as it is thus acquired, is by its very nature self-righteousness. The cherishing of this conception of righteousness as something to be attained only on a basis of law and of merit would inevitably be a serious obstacle to a hearty acceptance of Jesus, or would become so the moment the real spirit and teaching of Jesus were understood. "The very spirit of humility and lowliness of mind which Jesus



exemplified and inculcated were calculated to repel one who had not only accepted as a dogma the Pharisaic idea of self-acquired righteousness, but had become imbued with the self-sufficient spirit likely to be cultivated by the holding of this dogma. 4. Saul had, before he became a Christian, attained as nearly perfect success in his effort to become righteous as under this method was possible. 5. His persecution of the Christians was in some sense conscientious (Acts xxvi. 9). His own statements concerning it show us a man of profound moral earnestness pursuing a course of bitter persecution of the Christians under the stress of a sincere conviction of duty. 6. Despite his success in attaining the righteousness that is in the law, despite his conscientiousness in persecuting the Christians, Saul was not wholly at ease. The words "It is hard for thee to kick against the goads" imply three things: that Saul was at this time subject to certain influences tending to turn him from the course which he had chosen; that he was resisting those influences; that such resistance involved some struggle on his part. Probably in his life as a Pharisee he was, at times at least, and probably with increasing frequency and intensity, greatly dissatisfied with his general moral condition. "The passages in his epistles in which he speaks with such emphasis and feeling of the unhappy condition of men under the law must certainly reflect his personal experience, even if they were not based wholly upon that experience." "It was then a conscientious and upright man, ill at ease with himself, who rode from Jerusalem to Damascus to persecute the Christians; haunted perhaps by vague doubts which he could not wholly suppress respecting the rightfulness of this very mission, certainly dissatisfied at times with all his success as a Pharisee, painfully aware that his highest success was after all a failure."

7. Up to the time that he met Jesus in the road leading to Damascus, Saul had not believed in a Messiah who was to suffer and rise again. The evidence outside of the New Testament seems to fall short of proving that a suffering Messiah was looked for by the Jews of Jesus' day. From the point of view of the Pharisaic dogmatics, it was impossible to accept Jesus as the Messiah. The argument against Him was short and easy. The Messiah does not die, still less does He die rejected by His own nation. Jesus did die thus rejected; therefore Jesus is not the Messiah. With this was necessarily connected the denial of the resurrection of Jesus. That denial did not rest on any opposition to the general doctrine of resurrection, but on unwillingness to admit that one regarded as an impostor could have received such a Divine attestation. Both Jews and Christians thought the resurrection of Jesus, if it was a fact, would be proof of His Messianic claims. This appears in the anxiety of the Jews to disprove the fact, and in the anxiety of the Christians to keep it ever in view. Denying the doctrine of a suffering Messiah led, since Jesus had died, to the denial of His Messiahship. Denial of His Messiahship necessarily involved the denial of His resurrection, since His resurrection would have been a Divine attestation of this Messianic claim.

"There is no direct evidence that Paul felt any hostility to the personal character of Jesus. His profound moral earnestness, his eager quest after righteousness, and the readiness with which he accepted Christ when once the dogmatic obstacles to faith were broken down, lead us to believe that he would have been strongly attracted by the character of Jesus." Righteousness, in the sense of character acceptable to God, was still for him the great thought of life. There was an antagonism between the character of Jesus and the ideals of Saul created by the lowliness of Jesus and the spirit of Pharisaic self-sufficiency. But possibly in this there was a marked difference between Saul and his fellow-Pharisees.

There were four obstacles to Paul's acceptance of Jesus, two intellectual and two moral. 1. He could not believe in a rejected and suffering Messiah. 2. He believed in righteousness obtainable by obedience to the law. 3. He was seeking for righteousness in his own strength. 4. He was resisting the evidence and the influences tending to show that his present course was wrong. On the other hand, his moral advantages were: (1) his moral earnestness; (2) his eager desire to be righteous before God, and his freedom from vice and empty formalism; and (3) his dissatisfaction with his old life and inward unrest. The question for consideration is, How would such a man be affected by the Damascus experience? It is certain that Paul thought he then actually saw Jesus Christ. This at once overthrew his first intellectual obstacle to the acceptance of Jesus. To see the risen and glorified Jesus is to be compelled to accept the fact of His resurrection. To accept the fact of His resurrection is to acknowledge His Messiahship. It does not remove the difficulty of a suffering Messiah; it simply overwhelms all objections by the superior might of the argument of the visible appearance of Jesus of Nazareth. And it is not less important to see that it at once demolished Paul's confidence in the righteousness that is attainable by law. "In one blow the whole structure of self-acquired righteousness is overthrown. He is himself the consummate flower of Pharisaism, the highest product of righteousness attainable under the system of law, and yet it is revealed in this revelation of Jesus Christ that he has been fighting against God Himself." The very perfection of Saul's obedience to the law before his conversion was an important element in this new conviction. He may not have realized at once all that was involved in the overthrow of his former view. But all his subsequent theology is but the unfolding of the logical consequences of the discovery which, as in a flash of lightning, he made when he was smitten down as he approached Damascus.

We further inquire what effect the epiphany of Jesus had upon the moral obstacles which stood in the way of Saul's acceptance of Him as the Messiah and his Saviour. His seeking of righteousness by his own strength, dependence on law as against faith, could remain after the demonstration of the futility of the method only by obstinate resistance to evident duty. He had been resisting evidence; here is overwhelming evidence. He had been deceived by the darkness of his own soul, but here is light. The change in him is one of profound moral significance. The spirit of self-dependence bars God out of the soul. Faith opens the door to God, and brings light and hope where before were failure and anguish. In Phil. iii. 4-9 Paul describes his conversion as an abandonment of the principle of righteousness, and the acceptance of faith instead thereof.

But it may be said that, seeing righteousness was already the supreme object of his endeavour, the absence of faith could not be a fatal defect. Does the coupling of the spirit of self-dependence to the eager desire to be righteous fatally vitiate it? Or does the existence of the sincere desire to be righteous show that faith is already germinally present? It must be granted that, as the New Testament teaches, faith is the only right, in the end the only successful, method of attaining righteousness. But if righteousness is really the supreme desire of the soul, in this desire there is latent the true method of attaining it, viz., faith. On the other hand, the absence or repudiation of faith is the index of the fact that the desire for righteousness is not supreme; that the soul desires righteousness indeed, but desires it subject to the condition that it shall be wrought out in self-dependence. And this is to make self supreme, not righteousness. If we conceive Paul as making the self-effort supreme, then his acceptance of Jesus by faith was at the same time the supreme choice of righteousness. In the one act he elected the only right object of endeavour and the

only successful way of its attainment. Paul always speaks as if the difference between righteousness by law and righteousness by faith was for those to whom he wrote fundamental. "We are almost driven to say that if he had before his Damascus experience made such choice of righteousness as that his attitude towards God was already fundamentally right, and his conversion a change of opinion rather than of heart, he himself never discovered the fact." Surely the conversion was one in the deepest sense of the term—a choice of righteousness and a surrender to God through faith in Christ; an act fundamentally changing his attitude toward God and fundamentally affecting his character.

**MAN'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIS BELIEFS.** By G. R. W. SCOTT, D.D., Brookline, Mass. (*Christian Thought*).—Man is a creature of God; but matter is also God's creation. The two, however, differ. Matter obeys a law; but man's action is not due to a law which must be implicitly obeyed. Man is created a free moral agent. He has the endowments of self-consciousness, conscience, reason, choice, and will. He is, as is matter, connected with a law, but as a steward, not as a tool; he is bound, but not necessitated, to obey it. There is a moral obligation, but no imperative and abstract necessity determining his action. A free agent is one who, according to the teachings of his reason, can adopt or not adopt a line of action presented. He has power to choose between different motives and impulses which call for action. This is essential to constitute moral action, and consequent responsibility. Responsibility denotes answerableness (*respondeo*), and intimates power to discharge obligation. Belief includes that which has moral character—that which demands choice, reason, affection, and will. Is man, then, responsible for his beliefs? Acts are the logical results of beliefs. A man is and does what he believes. If one is responsible for his beliefs, he is by consequence responsible for his acts.

1. Responsibility for beliefs is taught by nature. When her laws are violated, penalties are inflicted. Nature is inexorable in her demands, and deals with man as a responsible being of some kind. The scientist and poet, both students of nature, though approaching her for different ends, agree in saying that she deals out severest justice to any rebel in her realm, while upon the loyal she bestows her sweet embraces. 2. Law, as crystallized by government, teaches in clearest language that man is responsible for his acts, for his *intents*, as traced back from the act or the attempt. Our legislation, laws, courts, and jails are all founded upon the belief that man is responsible for his acts, and therefore his beliefs. Responsibility is at the very basis of morals. It is in the very nature of things. Out of it sprang laws and all restraints. Law, as well as nature, does not excuse man when he acts contrary to it, because the criminal considers vice and virtue a peculiar arrangement of matter, and that he has nothing more to do with the one or the other than with the size of his frame or the colour of his hair. Legislation looks not alone at the external act, but at the motive of the agent. The intention defines the act, and puts it in the proper category. The intention involves freedom. Dr. Scott sums up the matter thus: "No freedom, no responsibility; no responsibility, no obligation; no obligation, no sense of duty; no sense of duty, no morality; no morality, no distinction between right and wrong."

Looking at man himself, is not responsibility for belief and act the very part of the nature bestowed upon him? By experience we find that good and right actions fit best in man's constitution, that they tend to man's happiness and harmony, and that they are in agreement with the thought of a God. The idea of God is a necessity of thought. Man is so constituted that he demands some self-existent Being. Human reason recognizes a higher reason. The pronoun I has wrapped up in it that from

which comes the idea of moral obligation. This conscious personality it is which differentiates man from all other animals. Man knows he is a self-determining being, that he has reason, affection, intuition of universal principles, power of choice, and also of unifying knowledge, freedom of will, a moral and religious nature, and the capacity of knowing and loving God. These are the constants of human consciousness. Man knows he has the primary conditions of responsibility. This is the testimony of experience, the universal belief of civilized men. When consciousness rises to moral law, conscience shows itself. Man, there, recognizes more distinctly authority, which to him is a grand source of moral obligation. The Divine will proclaims through conscience the eternal law of right, and places obligation upon man. Duty rises so plainly, and presses so closely, that it is recognized as an integral part of man's constitution. It is even recognized by those who deny any *ought*, when they tell us we *ought not* to recognize the sense of duty. The untutored savage recognizes the close relation of knowledge and light to responsibility.

Choice, wherever the freedom of the will is expressed, is somewhat different from volition, the executive power. An animal has volitions, but makes, we believe, no choices. An animal is compelled by instincts and impulses, but man is impelled by motives. Man's volitions are the logical outcome of his choices, and by consequence he feels that he is responsible for what is wrong in his volitions. He is conscious of bringing the will into exercise, of forming his beliefs. For the proper employ of the will, which is under his control, man is responsible. The will is not in bondage to temptations or motives that it *must* fall. If it fall, it is the result of choice and not of compulsion. We fully admit the strength of lower impulses, and also that there are modifications of responsibility so far as character is influenced by conditions determined by a higher power, and so far as action results from habits or tendencies, independent of choice, and which have not come into the realm of the will; but it is also seen that man has the power, within limits, of modifying his character, and so far as this power extends is he responsible for the modifications. We may say, then, that the complex constitution of man, as well as nature and law, holds man responsible alike for his beliefs and his acts.

Now, the appeal may be made to God's Word, what is its message in reference to man's responsibility? The Bible supplies man's illuminated reason, the demands of true philosophy, in naming One who controls all things, even the disorder of a sinful world, in giving One who will enforce the laws of right, and meet the demands of justice; but, going farther, in presenting One who can overcome evil by good, and restore man to himself, his fellow-men, and to his God. The Bible gives us explicit testimony in reference to man's responsibility for his beliefs. It is the eternal enemy of any form of pantheistic philosophy. It has nothing to do with such immanence as makes duty, truth, obligation, purity, evanescent. It tells even the pagan world that it is responsible for its beliefs. It judges the heathen by the light and knowledge received. It tells man that God, as the moral Governor of the universe, knows our secret thoughts, and can judge our opinions and beliefs. It declares that belief in God is a duty, and unbelief a sin. It attaches moral character to belief and unbelief; and its language in respect of these things is in agreement with the principles of true philosophy. Man is responsible for his beliefs, and acts because nothing unreasonable is demanded of him.

A man's habits influence opinion. If a man blink his moral sight by sin of any kind, such an immoral bandaging will blind the intellect. When the heart is corrupted the mind becomes perverted. Is he, *then*, no longer responsible for his belief? Observe that it is not lack of evidence but of will which has made him what



he is, and that will is under the control of perverted affections. Even the pagan and the imbruted know more than they put in practice, and are thus guilty before God.

Man is no mere machine, with no will and no faculty of choice, but a being of great importance in the sight of God, because made in His likeness. God has entrusted to him great concerns. Upon his faithfulness depends, in great measure, the progress of the world. To him is given work which is for the glory of God. With power to do, with light to see, with knowledge to direct, with motives to induce, with promises to hearten, man must incur a fearful penalty when he refuses to obey God's commands.

THE MONISTIC THEORY OF THE SOUL. By JAMES T. BIXBY, Yonkers, N.Y. (*The New World*).—Among the problems confronting the psychologist in these days is that of the nature of the soul and its fundamental relation to the body. Whatever answer we give to this psychologic problem, it will colour and determine our æsthetic, political, moral, and religious convictions. The controversy is now carried on with more caution than twenty years ago, and on different lines. On the other hand, among the advocates of a permanent spiritual reality as the ground of consciousness, we find no such positive assurance and dogmatic condemnation of their opponents as was formerly current. They freely grant to the organism and cerebral processes and conditions very great influence. Every day it is more widely admitted that the "psychological asceticism," as Prof. Sully well calls it, which would disown the body altogether, and elaborate its theory of mind-action from pure introspection, is hopelessly sterile and belated. On the other hand, among psychologists of distinction, the old-time materialism has become almost extinct. Comte reduced psychology to a department of physiology, but to-day the foremost expositors of mental phenomena claim for this domain characteristic functions and qualities not to be confounded with any lower realm or merged in it. Thus, Prof. James Sully says, "The modern scientific psychologist follows the tradition of philosophic spiritualism so far as to insist on the radical disparity between the psychical and the physical. A sensation is something intrinsically dissimilar to any form of physical movement, such as presumably takes place in the nervous system. Consequently psychical processes cannot be included in, and studied as, a part of the functional activities of the bodily organism. However closely connected with these last, they form a group of phenomena of a quite special kind." This certainly indicates a decided ebbing of the materialistic tide. The agent to which it is due is modern science, with its precise measurements and its inexorable laws. When the laws of the correlation and transformation of the various modes of force were first discovered, the materialists were jubilant; thought would soon be shown to be "a mere mode of motion." But when the discovery was brought to strict scientific tests, unexpected difficulties were met with. If mental phenomena are physical forces transformed, they must be subject to the established laws of the conversion and correlation of energy. But this is not the fact. So the transformation theory has given way to the view that physical and mental phenomena move together, side by side, but that neither passes over into the other, or has any causal connection with it. But this is not wholly satisfactory, because it leaves an impassable gulf between matter and mind.

A more rational theory is found in the monistic theory of the soul. According to this view, the nervous and the mental circuits are not independent series, but dual forms of one and the same event. Lewes declares that "a mental process is only another aspect of a physical process. There is no more difference between a nerve vibration and the accompanying sensation than between the concavity and the

convexity of one and the same arc." This theory is really due to Spinoza: "He essayed to put mental activity in a position where it could safely allow to the physical series all that uninterrupted causal connection which he foresaw that it would insist upon for itself." Professor Clifford regarded this theory as "not merely a speculation, but a result to which all the greatest minds that have studied this question in the right way have gradually been approximating for a long time." The latest advocate of monism is Dr. Paul Carus. In his work, *The Soul of Man*, he starts with a consideration of feeling and motion. They are radically different, but feelings cannot exist by themselves. They are states that accompany motions. Every natural process is animated with the elementary germs of psychic life. Feeling and motion are abstractions of thought. The reality from which they are abstracted is one inseparable whole, which from the subjective side appears as feeling, from the objective as motion. Their doubleness is due to our different modes of apprehension. Every atom has, therefore, its sentient side, or element of feeling. It is only, however, when it is combined and organized with a group of its fellows into a fitting structure that these dim elements of feeling are combined into full feeling, and these simple feelings concentrated into what deserves the name of mind. Feelings grow into mind by being interpreted, by becoming representative. By repetition and the possession of memory they become significant of the presence of certain objective facts. The growth of mind is spontaneous, a necessary outcome of a combination of feelings. From these perceptions ideas develop, and finally the sense of self. The definition of soul is therefore "the form of an organism." Consciousness is no motor power. The subject, or self, is not a mysterious agent distinct from the different ideas, but it is the very idea itself. Man's mind is a society of ideas of which now one and now another constitutes his ego.

This monistic theory has been widely accepted. It meets exactly that desire for complete unity and simplification which is the master impulse of modern thought. But it will hardly stand careful criticism. Pure matter, the monists see, can never explain the origin of thought or feeling. So they remodel the idea of matter, and add to it, as original and universal qualities, the elements of sentience, and a subjective side. The knot of difficulty that the problem of the soul presents is the co-existence in the thinking man of sentience and materiality. The monistic theory simply takes the two attributes, whose co-existence in the whole body is so difficult to understand, and roundly asserts that they co-exist in every fibre, bone, molecule, and cell, and then calmly assumes that the enigma is made clear. But this is no explanation of the difficulty; it is only a restatement of it in other terms.

On the monistic theory, there should be a constant and exact ratio between the size and elaboration of the brain and the manifestation of mental power. A general correspondence there is, but nothing more. A table made by Dr. Boyd, from 1,607 post-mortem examinations, shows that the human brain reaches its *maximum of weight*, in proportion to the rest of the body, between the ages of seven and fourteen; it then begins to decrease through life. While intelligence is rapidly increasing from twenty to sixty, the brain is actually *diminishing*, both relatively and absolutely. "That which constitutes the essence of mind—its capacity to judge and discriminate; to adjust itself to an unforeseen contingency; to learn by experience; to associate conceptions on rational grounds; to subordinate physical energies to moral considerations; to adopt an intelligent plan, and bend hostile circumstances, by force of wit and will, to its advance—all these lie in a realm of law of which physical force knows nothing."

The author elaborately discusses the objections to the monistic theory which may

be suggested from various points of view, and comes to this general conclusion:—"The more one studies the monistic theory, and the expositions made of it by its advocates, the more plainly do we see that it is a theory standing in unstable equilibrium. As long as the scales are held exactly even, the problem of the co-existence of the mental and the material is simply shoved further back and made a universal mystery, and its insolubility seems to be tacitly admitted. As soon as it essays to explain things more clearly, it slips off either into monistic idealism or a more or less blank materialism."

WHAT IS BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, AND WHAT IS ITS METHOD? By Prof. GEORGE B. STEVENS, PH.D., D.D., Yale University (*The Biblical World*).—In America Biblical Theology is a department of study distinct from Exegesis, and distinct from Systematic or Doctrinal Theology. Continental theologians have long cultivated Biblical Theology as a separate branch of study. Biblical Theology is the scientific presentation, on the basis of Exegesis, of the contents of each type of Biblical teaching. These types may be represented by a single book, or by the various writings of a single author, or by the books of various authors which belong together by reason of likeness of contents or some other similarity. The method of Biblical Theology is especially adapted to exhibit the individuality of the Biblical writers. Its immediate aim is to reproduce in the clearest manner, and in systematic form, the ideas of the writer who is the subject of study at the time. When each type has been exhaustively studied by itself, the work of comparison can be hopefully attempted.

Biblical Theology is the systematized result of Exegesis. In Exegesis we take the books one by one, and study them critically from beginning to end. Then Biblical Theology asks, What does the writer in question teach concerning God, concerning sin, and the like? Exegetical study which is not carried to its true culmination in Biblical Theology is likely to leave the mind of the student embarrassed by the details which are inseparable from its method, without conducting him to any clear and definite doctrinal results. It may be asked, Is not Doctrinal Theology Biblical? If we grant that Systematic Theology is Biblical, there is still a useful place for Biblical Theology in theological education, on account of its peculiar aim and method. "The doctrinal theologian must treat the various themes of theology in a philosophical method and spirit. His aim is to justify them to reason, to defend them against objections, and to incorporate them into a system—a rational construction of doctrines." There is necessarily a large apologetic element in Systematic Theology, and, as it has commonly been pursued, a large metaphysical and speculative element. Biblical Theology, on the other hand, distinctly disclaims any philosophical or speculative method. "The Biblical theologian places himself, for the time, in the age and circumstances of the writer with whom he is dealing. He asks simply what this writer says or means, not how that can be justified to reason, defended against objection, harmonized with the teaching of other writers, or translated into the equivalents of modern thought, and made part of a general scheme of doctrine. He abjures all such questions. He tries to see with the writer's eyes, and to think his thoughts after him. He seeks to apprehend the form and matter of the writer's thought according to the manner of his time; to place himself at the writer's standpoint and to read him in the light of his age and circumstances.

Exegesis and Biblical Theology have hitherto been less diligently and thoroughly cultivated than Systematic Theology. Our theological systems have been fortified by the citation of "proof texts," which have been too often employed without a careful and just estimate of their significance in their original connection, and without appreciation of the Biblical writer's standpoint, purpose, or mode of thought.

Biblical Theology will operate as a check upon the extravagance of the proof text method. It presents to the doctrinal theologian the Biblical material, organized and systematized. There exists just now a certain distrust of theological systems. The temper of the age offers a great opportunity to Biblical Theology. The critical spirit holds sway. The demand of the time—so far as theology is concerned—is for a thorough and impartial investigation of Biblical teaching in its genetic development and its various forms. Biblical Theology, if developed in a critical and scientific spirit, and at the same time with a reverent appreciation of Biblical truth, will be one of the greatest aids to Doctrinal Theology, and will inevitably have the effect of arousing interest in it.

CHRIST, THE CHIEF CORNER-STONE. By Rev. A. J. HELLER, A.M. (*The Reformed Quarterly Review*).—The expression is found in the passage, Ephes. ii. 19-22. Christ is declared to be the original and perpetual ground and source of the Church. In Him alone is to be found that which is essential for gathering those who are to compose its membership, building them up in righteousness and holiness of life, and uniting them into one harmonious body. He is the principle or source of knowledge, of power, and of unification; and these are a threefold manifestation of the one principle, comprehending the revelation of God, namely, Christ Jesus. In the power of the Holy Ghost the Apostles went forth to preach the Gospel. They proclaimed Jesus crucified, risen, living, and life-giving. They demanded repentance and faith. He who responded was said to be "born again." The knowledge which awakened a sense of sin and need, which pointed the way, and caused men to surrender themselves unreservedly to Christ, was the dawning of a new life within them. The next step in the building up of souls thus gathered was instructing them in regard to the privileges and obligations of the Christian life; and Christ Jesus was held up to view as the model of character and of action.

Many practical questions pressed for solution. On many of them Christ had given no formal deliverance, but the endowment of the Spirit enabled Apostles to deal with them. The Holy Spirit adds no new faculty to man; He reveals no new fundamental fact or institution, no other universal, all-comprehending principle, for there can be but one such. Man is influenced by the indwelling of Christ, but he is free to think and free to act. This leaves room for progress in revelation, or the gradual unfolding of the truth presented once for all in the incarnate Son of God, which is the same as to say for development of doctrine and Christian character. We observe such progress already in the time of the Apostles. They give unmistakable evidence of growth in knowledge and strength. The people of every age and every nation are called upon to solve for themselves the problem of their own salvation by adapting the Gospel to their own needs.

There is a sense in which the Bible comes before Christ. It preserves for the world the knowledge of Him, and heralds His presence; it pictures His character and life, but men thus directed to Him come to understand Him more fully, and to know Him better, afterwards, in their own religious consciousness and personal experience. The Bible must be interpreted in the light of Christ's character and life. If Christ is the type of man, man is akin to God, and the modes of thought and reasoning are the same in both. If there are contradictions, as some affirm, in the sacred Scriptures, these must be dealt with, adjusted, or resolved in such a way as to accord with the character and life of their Author. When men make some doctrine, mode of worship, form of government, or mode of administration central, instead of Christ, they turn the Bible into a treasury of ready-made theories and plans.

Knowledge is not partitive. It is not a commodity which can be in part or in



whole separated from its possessor. The teacher simply reveals the thoughts, states, and intents of his mind, by which he elicits like thoughts, states, and purposes in the mind of the reader or hearer. The Bible does not teach. It is Christ who teaches, by and through the Word and the Church. "The chief point, then, is to keep Christ always in view, to trust Him with implicit faith, to follow whithersoever He leads in thought and life, and then we shall not fail to know and to understand His Word so as to be able to apply it. Then will the Bible be a more real Word of God to us than it can possibly be on the basis of a shallow Bibliolatry."

But while knowledge is of great importance, an abstract word cannot save. Along with the knowledge must go the power of a living person. Every word of communication must possess real contents, otherwise it is a mere empty sound without meaning or force. But whence comes the power? It has its source in Christ Jesus our Lord. It is His work; His power acting on and through man. This wonderful work is not accomplished by an abstract word spoken to man, but by Christ's own peculiar and special indwelling presence with him. Of course, it is not meant that Christ, in any material or partitive sense, imparts Himself, or any portion of Himself, to His people. Illustration may be taken from that subtle electric influence which one man exerts over another. The wise and good, by their consistent words and actions, always impart something of themselves to their fellows. In like manner, but in a far deeper sense, are men strengthened and quickened by constant communication with Christ: only they must apprehend or lay hold on Christ in order to receive moral and spiritual power.

The knowledge and power which issue from their source in Christ are the means of blending Christians of all times and places into one body whose head is the Lord. Christ is the unifying principle; for as in Him men become reconciled to God, they likewise in Him become reconciled to each other. Christians may differ in opinions, and perhaps always will, on a thousand or more subordinate, non-essential matters, on the nature of the sacraments, on methods of worship, on forms of Church government, on modes of administration, but on this vital and essential point, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and unreserved consecration to His service, they are and must be one. It used to be very popular, and it sounded very plausible to say, "We make the Bible the foundation of Christian life and fellowship." But the cry in time proved itself a cheat and a fraud, for it was always the Bible as they who raised the cry understood it. "The only reason why the different branches of the Church are not more closely united to-day is, because men have not yet learned fully and clearly to distinguish non-essentials from essentials, and to practise mutual forbearance in matters of opinion in respect to that which in no way affects or conflicts with sound saving faith and right living. Whether organic union is necessary or not may be disputed, but if true Church union is ever to be realized in this world, it must work itself out from Christ as the centre and principle of life and co-operation—the 'chief corner-stone.'"

THE LIMITS OF LEGITIMATE RELIGIOUS DISCUSSION. By BISHOP COLEMAN, Delaware (*The North American Review*).—A discussion which calls into question the fundamental principles of religion is not legitimate. A discussion which involves disrespect to them transcends its proper bounds. Is there in the United States any form of religion which may be called national, and which its adherents may on that account consider entitled, so far as its fundamental principles are concerned, to limitation of debate? This must be answered in the affirmative. From the very beginning of its colonization the United States has distinctly recognized Christianity as its religion. Thus Chancellor Kent, of New York, delivered

in 1811, the following opinion: "The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity as their faith and practice." The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania subsequently ruled that "even if Christianity were not a part of the law of the land, it is the popular religion of the country; an insult to which would be indictable as tending to disturb the public peace," adding that "no society can tolerate a wilful and spiteful attempt to subvert religion." It may therefore be affirmed that a discussion which would include within its limits an attack upon the fundamental principles of Christianity is, so far as that attack is concerned, distinctly illegitimate. We recognize this dogma when applied to civil affairs. When a citizen essays to bring into disrepute the fundamental principles of that form of government under which he is living, he is accounted a traitor, and is liable to arrest and punishment. Is it not much more treasonable to bring into contempt the institutions and tenets of Christianity? Hardly anything is more injurious to the State than a lack of confidence between man and man. It threatens the disruption of the very bonds of society. And this is the risk that is run in allowing religious discussions to go on indefinitely and wantonly, robbing men of their faith in God and Christ, and so, in time, of their faith in one another, for faith in man has its highest development among those who believe in God.

But what are the fundamental principles of Christianity? None is more distinctly so than a belief in the personality of its Founder, Jesus Christ. And with this goes the equally fundamental belief in Him as both God and Man. Few deny the fact of His existence. More refuse to acknowledge His Divinity. And herein lies a transgression of the limits of legitimate religious discussion. Indeed, one who denies the Divinity of Christ takes himself out of religious discussion altogether—at least so far as this country is concerned. He robs Christianity of that which primarily makes it the religion of the world, and reduces it simply to a system of wilful deceit and shameless wickedness. I would not condescend to enter into a debate with one who should wish to discuss the character of my mother—that is, as to her goodness. Shall I be compelled to discuss religious matters with one who does not recognize Christ's Divinity? The disciples of Christ's religion have good grounds for insisting that its verity should not be so frequently impugned as it is with stale, worn-out, and a hundred-times-answered statements and arguments. These repetitions do but little credit to those intellectual gifts to whose exercise the impossibility of accepting Christianity is attributed.

May we not say that in the truths of Christianity we have reason in its highest form? Without them, indeed, reason oftentimes becomes only another name for will, and is set against conscience. Our reasoning powers when alone, without the aid of the Spirit of God, are likely—nay, one may say certain—to become most weak and untrustworthy in dealing with moral and religious truth. Christians acknowledge mysteries beyond, though not contradictory to, our reason. Our opponents insist upon understanding all things. When they come to such as pass their comprehension, these are rejected as untrue. They would substitute for Christianity a human system or theory. Christianity is the religion of reason, and of reason in its strength and purity. It is the answer to the soul's deepest and truest wants, and of its common wants. Thus, as related to all men, it is a religion of history. It is founded on facts. The first Adam was no myth. Neither is the second Adam an abstract idea. Christ is—not only was, but is—a person. And it is as being a person of perfection, the Incarnate Son of God Himself, that we feel that in assaulting Christianity *He* is assaulted, and in assaulting *Him* all virtue and all grace are likewise assaulted, and that in assaulting them the very foundations of our life are liable to be overthrown.

However true it is that many divisions exist among Christians, yet it is equally true that to all alike the doctrine of Christ's Divinity and of man's salvation through His atonement is too dear to allow it to be questioned by any one.

And these limits I would set not only as regards the discussion of His nature and His character, but also as regards the discussion of His commandments. The two sacraments were unquestionably ordained by Christ Himself. But how flippantly oftentimes, is the question of their obligation discussed; it ought to be beyond the legitimate limits of a religious discussion. I know how liable one is to be misunderstood who sets up such a strong claim for Christianity, but in setting up a weaker claim one is thereby lowering the standard of morality. For while it is true that by our unduly magnifying morality we belittle Christianity, it is equally true that in belittling Christianity we degrade morality.

We are much too lenient as to the immorality of so-called moral men; of men who, while they select certain precepts for their obedience, treat with disdain other precepts just as binding upon their consciences. A really Christian man is always a moral man; but he who is only what the world calls moral may be very far from being a Christian man.

Holding such views concerning the significance of the terms "Christian" and "moral," the Bishop declares he cannot but feel that persons who venture to deny the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, and the obligations of His sacraments, practically transgress the limits of legitimate religious discussion, inasmuch as these principles are fundamental to its existence.

**PAUL'S PURPOSE IN WRITING ROMANS.** By MELANCTHON W. JACOBUS, D.D. (*The Presbyterian Quarterly*).—However germinal may have been the theology Paul received on the Damascus road, he thought it out in the years that intervened between his conversion and his settled work, and kept developing it as his work went on. However profound may have been the inspired thoughts which, when that work was over, he gathered into his epistle to the Church at Rome, he had behind them the personal experience of all his journeys over the mission fields, and all the close contact into which those journeys had brought him with the souls of men, in the deep darkness and foul deadness of their sin. Back of the epistle is the personal experience. Paul was the Calvinist he was, not only because of the truths which he had received from God, but also because of the confirming facts which had confronted him in the world in which he lived and worked.

The theories as to Paul's purpose in writing the epistle gather into two general groups. 1. Those who hold that the motive was determined by the needs of the Church to which the letter was sent. This group subdivides into the didactic, and the polemic. 2. Those who hold that the motive was determined by the needs of the Apostle who sent it. The didactic group holds in substance that the epistle is an attempt on Paul's part to present to the Roman Church a systematic exposition of Christian truth for their enlightenment and strengthening in the faith. This is the ancient view, and is taken by the middle age scholastics, the Reformers, and the later German and French critics and expositors. The polemic group holds in brief that the letter was written to combat a tendency to Judaistic views in the Church at Rome. Some thinking there was a Judaistic party in the Church, others regarding the trouble as one which Paul anticipated. This view was held by Augustine and others, by Erasmus, Tholuck, Ewald, and some recent writers. The group which considers the epistle to have been determined by the Apostle's needs holds that the purpose is an apologetic one; and that Paul's aim was to prepare for himself a favourable reception at Rome in view of the prejudices which existed in that Church.

Some take those prejudices to be against himself, some take them to be against the doctrine of his Gospel, and some take them to be against the practice of his Gospel work. There is much to be said in favour of this theory.

Much depends on the composition of the Church at Rome. Whether the Church was prevailingly Jewish or Gentile will be quite significant in considering whether the letter was or was not a polemic against an actual or a threatened Jewish tendency in the people's midst. A very decided proportion of Jewish element must have been necessary to make Judaizing possible. What are the facts to be considered? 1. As to the Church's origin, the theory that it was founded by the Apostolic Peter during the reign of Claudius must be laid aside. It is incapable of historical proof. 2. There is a choice between two possible positions, (1) That the Church owed its origin mainly to the Jewish Christians who came from Palestine to Rome. (2) That the Church originated with Gentile Christians who came to Rome from other quarters than Palestine. The author examines the historical facts and references, and comes to the conclusion that, though the Jewish converts may have been the first to come to Rome, it was the Gentile converts who began the organizing of the Church there, and carried it on to that degree of organization which it had when the epistle was written. "We see nothing against the possibility of Jewish converts from Pentecost having been the first Christians at Rome, and yet the formal Church having been begun and carried on by the Gentile converts from regions outside of Palestine, and so having been definitely and decisively Gentile in its origin."

It was, then, to a Gentile Christian Church—Gentile in its development, Gentile in its then present condition—that the Apostle sent his letter. But we see at once how the above groups of views are affected by this fact. The *polemic* view is virtually set aside. For if the origin and development and growing character of the Church was Gentile, it becomes exceedingly difficult to find anything to justify the existence in its midst of a Judaizing party. The *didactic* group is rendered most improbable; for if the character of the Church was, from its origin, Gentile, and if that Gentilism grew as Paul's mission work extended, and his Gospel became known—a Gentilism of the Pauline type—where was the need for Paul to instruct it in the principles of his theology? The *apologetic* group is thrown into a decided doubt; for if the Church in its history was pre-eminently Gentile, and in its then present condition was Gentile, in a Pauline way, where could have been its prejudices against Paul himself, or his Gospel, or his mission work? It was the Jewish element which found fault with the Apostle's doctrine and work.

Moreover, a study of the epistle itself at once disposes of the didactic view, and that, too, simply because the contents of the epistle are not the contents of Paul's Gospel. There is lacking all discussion of the doctrines of Christology and eschatology. *A fortiori*, the contents of the epistle are not the contents of the general circle of Christian truth. There is no treatment of Creation, or the Incarnation, or the Church. The Epistle is specific, even within Pauline lines. A study of the epistle also renders the polemic view impossible. It is not, technically, a controversial epistle. There is but one passage that can, in any way, be said to refer to Judaizers (chap. iii. 8). The seemingly controversial parts are not a polemic against an opposition party in the Church.

It would seem as if we were driven for refuge to the apologetic view. But the study of the Epistle shows us how unsafe even such a refuge would prove. For if Paul desired, in writing this epistle, to remove from the Roman Church the prejudices which it had against him, because of his hostility to the Jews and his



partiality towards the Gentiles, then it is evident that he has taken a strange way of doing it. Testing the groups, we must conclude that neither of them is satisfactory.

There are two things to be considered in the solution of the problem, first the epistle and then the Apostle. "We must first secure a view that will fit in with the exegetical character of our epistle, and then we must put that view to the test of the Apostle's historical surroundings at the time of the epistle's composition. Though the epistle is no didactic *résumé* of the system of Christian truth, or of the circle of Pauline doctrines, it is nevertheless didactic in its form of presenting what truths it does include. There is a carefully prepared and conscientiously followed plan of instructing the Church at Rome from some specific point of view regarding some specific matter, and there is an evident desire on the Apostle's part to direct his instruction against some wrong views that this people held. There is throughout the epistle's doctrinal discussion an evident attitude against some error point. It would solve the problem if we could find the point. See what progress towards finding it has been made. "We have secured an idea of the general epistolary lay of the land—a didactic argumentative letter sent ahead to prepare for the Apostle's coming work. We are even located where the motive is likely to be found—in the erroneous views of his people, which the Apostle had in mind when he wrote the letter." What those views were is suggested by the peculiarities of the argument of the epistle. 1. The argument begins with an arraignment of the morals of the heathen world; and this with the manifold design of showing that mankind is in need of a righteousness other than its own. "Paul's purpose was to correct the attitude of the Gentile element in the Church at Rome. They were exalting his Gospel at the expense of the Jew. His plan in writing the epistle, therefore, was to take up this Gospel of his, so far as it was now wrought out intellectually in his mind and practically in his work, and show that, after all, it did not ignore the Jew, either as an essential element in the Christian Church or as the still unbelieving people of God outside of it. In other words, that his Gentile Gospel was not to be overpressed and placed in opposition to all the revelation and work of God so far. That it did not separate the Old and New Dispensations, but rather joined them vitally together. That it did not alienate, but rather united, the Jewish and Gentile Christian life."

This theory may be tested by the peculiar surroundings of the Apostle when he wrote the letter. Does it agree with them? Paul had finished his work in the East, and was in purpose now to begin it in the West. But his work in the East had been largely the struggle and victory of his Gospel of Gentile Christianity. What Gospel could have been more acceptable to the Gentile Christian Church—the Pauline Gentile Christian Church—at Rome? Where would it be more likely to be accepted with heartiness and propagated with zeal? And what more likely than that just this zeal would be an injury to the truth, distort it by over-pressing one side of it, hinder it by overburdening one part of it? So the view of Paul's motive agrees with just the historical situation in which the Apostle found himself when he wrote the letter. This being the situation in which he was, this was exactly the sort of letter that we should expect him to write.

This theory will account for the didactic cast given to the epistle; the misunderstanding of the Apostle's Gospel into which the Gentile element of this Church had fallen required that the true principles of that Gospel should be didactically presented to it. It will account for the polemic tone of certain portions of the letter; and it will equally account for whatever of an apologetic tone which may be discovered in it.

"The question is, What was the definite object which the Apostle had before him in view of the condition of affairs in the Church at Rome? We believe this question

is answered by the view which we have tried, however imperfectly, to present—the *correcting of the attitude of the Gentile element in the Church*. And if it accomplishes nothing in the future study of the epistle beyond bringing this element into a more careful consideration, assigning it at least a more definite place in the Church's position towards the Apostle, and a more decided part in the Apostle's thought towards the Church, we will be satisfied."

**SOME HOMILETIC USES OF THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION.** By Rev. HERBERT W. LATHE, Denver, Colorado (*Bibliotheca Sacra*).—Theodore Parker said that Reason acknowledges no unnecessary or useless truths. With greater force it may be urged that Revelation discloses no superfluous doctrines. The idea that the doctrine of election is of value only to the speculative theologian, but not profitable for instruction to the Church at large, is a mistake. The Apostle Paul does not embalm this doctrine in the wrappings of religious philosophy. The electing grace of God is far more to him than a necessary factor in a theological system. His logic is on fire with it. It is a significant but not a strange fact, that Paul, of all the inspired writers, should be the most fervid expositor of the doctrine of election. It is explained by his exceptional religious experience. It could easily be shown that the truths on which he lays stress in his epistles are those which had been emphasized in his conversion and subsequent Christian growth. The fact of election had grounded itself in his personal history. Never to the end of his life could he think of it as anything but a marvel that God laid a saving hand on him, the blasphemer, the persecutor, and enlisted all his powers in the service of Christ.

No man is ready to preach the doctrine of election until he has had something of this personal experience of it which fired Paul. The minister must approach the doctrine of election along the avenue of personal experience, if he is to speak to edification. "If he comes to it by way of his seminary lectures merely, or only along the road of philosophic investigation, his sermon will be as angular, hard, and heavy as the chiselled stone which the builder fits snugly into the arch. Out of his personal experience of the truth the preacher will so present it as to set before his hearers the meaning and the comfort of Christian sonship. The doctrine, rightly explained, will on the one hand define to the mind of the Church the true import of adoption into the family of God, and on the other hand will fortify the confidence of believers in the security of their standing in Christ. What makes us sons of God? Adoption into the family through Jesus Christ—God's eternal purpose in their redemption. His electing grace, unmerited, resisted from the first, inscrutable, infinitely merciful and condescending. Sonship is God's work in the soul.

The preacher will show that the doctrine of election assures the believer of his continuance in the faith even unto the end. Faith in electing grace blossoms into the assured hope of eternal life. God chose us; then He will hold us fast. There is much inspiration in this comfortable old doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. Turning to the relation of this doctrine to holy living, the preacher is tempted to present them in antithesis, as if utter reliance on electing grace might prove fatal to good works. He seeks to guard his hearers against the supposed evil consequences of trusting too much in God's choice of them, reminding them that, *although* they are chosen, they must *nevertheless* strive to lead righteous lives. The Scriptures do not present the case in this way. They set forth the fact of election as a great incentive to, and a sure guarantee of, good works. The only results which can follow trust in electing grace are obedience, fidelity, unreserved consecration. Is it objected that men will continue in sin that grace may abound?

In his own person Paul is the best answer to the objection—the most ardent believer in election leading the holiest life. But he answered the objection by saying that adoption means death unto sin, and “how shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?” The sense of having been chosen of God unto salvation will infallibly prompt the believer to live worthy of his high calling. In this doctrine the preacher has an irresistible leverage upon the noblest emotions of his people. If the believer is chosen to bear fruit, he is able to bear fruit.

The tendency of this doctrine to foster true humility would not be so worthy of note were not humility so elusive and treacherous a virtue. One way in which to aim at it is to abase the pride. This process may only leave a vacuum. Another way is to preach on sins and sinfulness. It is a bold preacher who often discourses directly upon Christian humility. The moment one thinks of it he is apt to lose it. If one cherishes it he may easily fall into morbid and unreal feeling. But the humility which comes of high honours bestowed, the sense of unworthiness which accompanies the wonder and joy of receiving spiritual gifts from God, is so free from the dross of self, and withal so grateful, so leavened with bold confidence, and so little in danger of excess, that were it only to produce such a virtue we might well preach often upon electing grace. If the preacher sets before his hearers the glory of their high calling in Christ, it will hardly be necessary for him to exhort at the close, “Put on therefore, as the elect of God, humbleness of mind.” The humility nourished by such preaching is a joyous, grateful humility, a virile Christian virtue, emptied of self because filled with Christ.

That the presentation of this doctrine will greatly exalt God in the minds of His people is manifest. Our thoughts dwell upon the infinite love and condescending of electing grace, and we gain sublime conceptions of the Divine nature. The believer should be taught to view his salvation as a spiritual miracle wrought by God for His own glory. Much of the piety of our day lacks depth, because the work of human redemption is regarded as having for its chief end the happiness of the redeemed. It is a Divine undertaking for the glory of God.

A vivid sense of having been chosen of God binds Christ's disciples together. Dr. Emmons said that he prevented Church quarrels by keeping his people interested in the great doctrines. None so good for this purpose as the doctrine that all disciples are made members of Christ's body by a sovereign act of God's will. We are already one in Christ. Not because we have agreed to some scheme of unity but because of God's act in choosing us. To repudiate the relationship is to sin against the grace which called us.

## CURRENT GERMAN THOUGHT.

RELATION OF THE PROLOGUE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL TO THE ENTIRE WORK. By A. HARNACK, Berlin (*Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1892, No. 3).—Dr. Harnack thinks that the influence of the Logos doctrine on the fourth Gospel has been overestimated. The conclusion to which his essay points is that the Prologue and the Gospel are quite disparate, and that the former was added merely to conciliate Greek readers. However little we may accept the results, and however singular, not to say contradictory, some of the opinions expressed, it is important for us to understand

the tendencies of the new Ritschl school which is so active and which is provoking so much discussion in Germany. The above periodical is its organ, and the school commands theological chairs in Berlin, Marburg, Giessen, Bonn, Tübingen, Kiel.

The questions which Dr. Harnack asks are such as these: What is the aim of the Prologue, and what that of the Gospel? Do these coincide, and is the Prologue really an introduction to the Gospel? Does the Gospel begin where the Prologue ends, and is the Prologue the quintessence, so to speak, of the Gospel? Is it the key for understanding, or entering into the holy place of, the Gospel?

1. First, the Gospel is considered apart from the Prologue. The aim of the Gospel is plainly stated in chap. xx. 31. It is to produce the faith that Jesus is the Messiah, who is the Son of God; life follows as a consequence of this faith. "The working out in every chapter corresponds to this purpose. It is conceived on the broadest plan. It is meant for the circle of disciples already won, for half believers, for Jews in their different aspects—even the Samaritans are not forgotten—the Greeks, all mankind. In regard to time also, it moves in universal ideas. It looks back to Abraham, Moses, and the law, and forward to all future believers. But even these limits are left behind. At the beginning and the end lies eternity; He who is spoken of embraces both. Here there is no detailed explanation, and all historic particulars vanish in the unity of the whole. There has never been an author, before or since, able to write history *sub specie aternitatis* in this fashion. The author not merely sinks time in eternity, but he is able also in his story to evoke a corresponding sentiment. He himself moves and lives in a supernatural element, and raises, with strong yet gentle wing, those who listen to him to the same height. Yet only the most superficial thought can suppose that there is nothing more than a general elevation to the supernatural. That to which he desires to raise us is not a new indefinite sphere of existence, however light and pure, but he leads to a *person*. This person is to him the light, the truth, the life. This supreme possession, as the substance of a historical life, has become to him a reality upon earth. If the ability of the author to lift history into eternity is astonishing, still more astonishing is his ability to combine this course with the magnifying of a historical person, who contains and imparts the fulness of all celestial blessings."

The nature of this great person—Christ—comes out in the names which He uses of Himself—the Sent of God, the Son of Man, *i.e.*, the Promised One, the Son, *i.e.*, the Son of God. Only the latter name corresponds fully to the author's view of Christ. "This is all the more noteworthy as the historical Jesus is everywhere the starting-point of the Gospel. He is the subject of all statements, not some one unknown, whom He represents. There is no question of a double personality, or of a separation of a heavenly and earthly one, a Divine and human one. To import such thoughts is to mistake the Evangelist's purpose. Rather everything said, however great and lofty, applies to the entire person, who stands over against disciples and foes." The proof in Christ's statements about Himself, that He is Son of God, is twofold, from the Son's perfect unity with the Father, and from His perfect dependence. The former is seen in the fact that the Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son, that Father and Son are one, and that whoever sees the Son sees the Father. Hence the Son possesses, and is all that the Father possesses and is. "The Son is the life, the light, the truth. Because by His teaching about Himself and His deeds He proves Himself the life, He is the Son; that life, light, and truth belong to the Godhead, *i.e.*, the Father, need not be shown." On the other hand, perfect dependence also proves that He is the Son. "The sayings, in which it is said in ever-varying phraseology, that Jesus does nothing of Himself,



but performs the work committed to Him by the Father, teaches what He hears from the Father, keeps the command which the Father has given Him, are perhaps the most numerous in the Gospel" (see iii. 34, vi. 38, v. 19, 20, 30, viii. 26). Having life in Himself (v. 26) does not disprove the dependence; mark "given," and "in yourselves" (vi. 53). "How the perfect subordination can exist in the Son along with that immanence of the Father may seem mysterious, and, as is well known, became a stumbling-block to after times, which those times by a bold stroke simply abolished. But to the Evangelist it was neither a stumbling-block nor a perplexing riddle. We learn from his letter why he found no problem here; he himself lived—by the Son—in a fellowship with God, in which he knew himself born of God and abiding in Him without losing the sense of God's majesty. The will of the Father, who is light and life, is the imparting of light and life first to the Son, then through the Son to all others."

The writer then enters upon a more detailed investigation of four points—(1) the meaning of the word "Son," and Son of Man; (2) the sayings of the Son about His pre-existence with the Father; (3) the use of "the Word" in the Gospel; (4) the separate working of the Father from that of the Son.

(1) The discussion of the first terms and the related term "only-begotten" is significant and remarkable. In the latter phrase, which is equivalent to "only" (*unicus*), no stress is to be laid on "begotten"; there is therefore no reference to a pretemporal generation or birth (see i. 18, iii. 16, 18). If "begotten" is to be regarded at all it must refer to "the historical Jesus in the totality of His manifestation." "Nowhere does Jesus where He calls Himself Son of God glance back at His eternal relation to the Father as born either in a realistic or metaphorical sense." "Jesus Christ, as He lived in time and space, not as a phantom, not as a double being, but in human form, is the Son of God. To Him, as to all men, belongs but one birth, by which He came to manifestation. The Evangelist does not state whether and in what sense the special Divine Sonship of Jesus is grounded in the nature of this birth into the earthly. One may therefore suppose that he assumed such a miraculous birth as Matthew and Luke speak of. But one may also suppose that the Evangelist contemplated the Sonship in the special relation in which the Father stood to this Jesus from the beginning. To decide here would be to do violence to the Evangelist's words. We are rather bound to stop where he himself stopped in his contemplation. The idea of a pretemporal generation and birth is not definitely excluded, because it is not suggested by anything that is said." "The expression, 'Son,' 'Son of God,' expresses His unique relation to the Father. No theory of the origin of this relation is given, nor does the idea go beyond the limits of the human existence of Jesus. He is the Son on the ground of the immanence of God the Father in Him, and the communication of the Father to Him springing from it."

Son of Man is made equivalent to Messiah on the ground of passages like i. 51, iii. 13, 14, v. 27, vi. 62, viii. 28, xii. 34: "the Messiah, as Daniel beheld Him (according to the interpretation of his prophecy then current), namely, dwelling in heaven with God and descended from heaven. The Evangelist using the name Son of Man for Messiah just where the Messiah is regarded as a heavenly being, makes it plain that to him faith in the heavenly nature of the Messiah was just as current as the word Son of Man to describe such a nature." "The phrase 'Son of Man' describes Jesus as the Messiah subject to God; but with this designation is inseparably united the idea, that He dwelt in heaven, came down from heaven, will ascend and be glorified, and finally sit in judgment. Thus, the exact converse of that which the common opinion assumes is true. The designation of Jesus as Son

of Man points directly to heaven and to 'metaphysics,' not the designation Son of God."

(2) The discussion of the idea of pre-existence results in a denial of actual pre-existence. It is pointed out that the idea is always connected with the Messiah or Son of Man, not the Son of God (i. 51, iii. 14, viii. 28, xii. 34, vi. 62). The humanity remains a fact, and no double personality is suggested. "The Messiah is indeed man, but still, and indeed as man, before His temporal manifestation He dwelt with God." There is no reference to an ideal man. The following is the explanation given: "Because God calls forth history, fixes its aims and guides it, therefore everything stands before Him, and what is to be developed by Him as great and lofty is prepared by Him 'before the foundation of the world.' Thus what is afterwards to appear on earth is already in heaven, and is the more certainly there the greater and loftier it is." This mode of conception was at first a way of honouring God; afterwards it was used to honour persons and things. In the age of Christ and the Apostles it was applied to the Messiah. "The Messiah, who as man will be born from men, dwells already with God in heaven. . . . How any one, who will be born as man, can already dwell with God before the creation of the world, men did not ask, because they did not philosophize, but desired to glorify God and the Messiah by such modes of expression. But when it was seen that the Messiah had come and not appeared at once in glory, the conclusion was drawn that He will be glorified (John xii. 23, xiii. 31), that as He came from heaven, He has gone back to heaven, in order to return to judgment." "There are no sayings about pre-existence in the sense now attached to the word; for they do not assert that Jesus existed as a Divine spiritual being (as *Δεῦρος ὁρατός*) before His earthly existence, but they transfer the *entire man* to the pre-worldly time with God." This is plain enough.

Dr. Harnack, however, candidly acknowledges that there are some passages where the idea of pre-existence is more prominent, and where it cannot be explained away by the above methods, as i. 30, iii. 31, viii. 23, and especially viii. 58. The further explanation cannot be called successful. "The solemnity with which it is introduced and used to solve a difficulty shows that the thought it contains was not merely a makeshift to the author, but was a decisive point in his faith in Jesus. It can, therefore, scarcely be doubted that he has alleged not merely an ideal pre-existence of Jesus, but a real existence with God. But he has neither connected this real pre-existence with the name of *Son*, nor has he said how it is to be exactly conceived. Those who assert the former, and also explain the nature of the pre-existence, import into the texts what is not to be found there. Only one thing can be said, that the sayings about the pre-existence cohere with the Evangelist's antithesis of above and below, heaven and earth, spirit and flesh, God and the world. But we must here guard against 'metaphysical' explanations. The pre-existence of the Son is to the author the self-evident conclusion from the facts that He is the sent of God, and that He is not from the world. It, therefore, contains no more than what lies in these two facts, but puts into complete, conscious expression what they contain. Here is no twilight, no dissolving of time into eternity; rather the Evangelist definitely takes Jesus back into eternity, thus removing Him from the antithesis ruling earthly existence." The writer then tries to establish a partial parallel between Christ and believers, who are also said to be "of God" (viii. 47), not "of the world"; to be first God's, and then given to the Son (xvii. 6); but confesses that "Jesus is from eternity that with God which they are to become through Him and are already only proleptically." "But if the pre-existence of Jesus in this sense is a feature in the fourth Gospel distinguishing it from all others, if they are only

*sub specie eternitatis* what He is, here also it is true that Jesus is what He is from eternity as this Jesus. In this connection also there is no allusion to a twofold element in Him, a Divine and a human nature. But, what is still more important, there is no hint that the Evangelist saw any riddle or problem here; he judges not by the impressions of space and time, but by the import. His only 'metaphysics' is found in vi. 13, 68. For this very reason he has no occasion for speculative reasoning. He is certain that He who speaks God's words is Himself spirit and life, and therefore belongs to God and to eternity."

(3) The writer then examines the sense in which "the Word" (Logos) is used in the Gospel apart from the Prologue. It occurs thirty-six times, and is never applied to Christ. Of course, no one questions this fact. But how this prevents the term being used in a personal sense in the Prologue we do not see.

(4) According to another line of teaching, the Father's working is sharply distinguished from that of the Son, in witnessing (v. 37), drawing to the Son (vi. 44), &c. This is said to show that in the Evangelist's eyes the Father and Son, despite all unity of nature as light, life, and truth, are "two really different subjects" (v. 17).

In summing up this part of the discussion, Dr. Harnack holds it equally wrong to suppose that the fourth Gospel makes the "consciousness of Jesus" either "simply human" or "Divine," or "a Divine one." These questions do not exist for the Evangelist. The Gospel, apart from the Prologue (i. 1-18), would never suggest the identity of Jesus with the Alexandrine or any other personified Divine Logos. The Gospel alone does not directly answer the question whether Jesus is God or man. Its standpoint is the Jewish tradition of the Messiah, while leaving the Jewish conception far behind. "The Saviour of the world, who meets us in the Gospel, whether He is called 'Son of Man,' 'Son,' or 'Son of God,' is not of the world, but from God; but He would not be Son of Man, &c., unless He were born, i.e., man. He reveals the Father by His words, discourses, acts, and demands to be honoured as God because He is one with Him. But His relation to God rests on the will of the Father, on His endowment and unity of will with the Father. Just for this reason He must be described as man. But in holy reverence the Evangelist has never said this plainly, because he requires that this Saviour be known and judged by the spirit of life proceeding from Him. Only thus does he himself know Him. Holding to this position, he must be utterly unintelligible to all Greeks and all who seek and inquire as they do." His standpoint is simply practical. He knows nothing of the "nature" of Christ, of which a Greek would think, but steadfastly closes his eyes to such questions. His answer on such points is unsatisfactory, looked at from the Greek standpoint, but satisfactory from that of Jewish thought and practical religion. "Religion seeks a tangible Saviour, in whom it becomes certain of God, and through whom it experiences God's working; everything else is indifferent to it. All those who looked for a Messiah expected a man who should realize the kingdom of Jehovah in Jehovah's strength. In this sense the religious standpoint of the Evangelist is the realized hope of Israel, perfected by the knowledge of Jesus Christ, purified and raised into the absolute religion. The Evangelist could therefore set himself no higher task than to produce the faith that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God. But, of course, by Messiah he understood, both extensively and intensively, something very different from what the Jews understood by this idea."

(2) The Prologue (i. 1-18) is next discussed. First of all, every attempt to sever the Prologue from the Gospel, or omit portions of it, must be resisted, "however difficult it may be to define the connection"; the agreement in decisive points is too close to

allow separation. Dr. Harnack is strongly convinced that the Logos-idea is of Alexandrian origin. "The Logos, here introduced, is the Logos of Alexandrian Judaism, the Logos of Philo. There is nothing in the first five verses which a Jewish philosopher of Alexandria could not have written; and, on the other hand, it is utterly unknown to us that any but an Alexandrian philosopher could so write about the year 100." We give the material parts of the exposition without the minute analysis of the verses which follows. We confess the difficulty of understanding much that is said in consistency with what has preceded.

"The Evangelist begins by putting the Alexandrian Logos-idea at the head, and continues this idea, making it the subject of the narrative. A comparison of vers. 1 and 18, the beginning and end of the Prologue, supplies an important key for understanding it. The opening says that the Logos is 'God,' and in the beginning of all existence, *i.e.*, before all existence, stood in a living relation to God. The close puts (1) the visible *Deus unigenitus* (or the *filius unicus*) in the place of the invisible Logos; (2) the return to the bosom of the Father, and abiding there in the place of the phrase, 'living relation to God'; (3) the statement that the knowledge of the Divine nature is now made accessible in the place of the saying respecting a supernatural mystery inaccessible to human eye and thought. Obviously the beginning is written in reference to this final verse; and when the author concludes with it, in order now to pass over to the narrative of the work of Jesus, it is plain that, by substituting the 18th verse for the 1st and 2nd, he has fulfilled his purpose in the Prologue." But the 18th verse cannot be understood without the 17th, for which it gives the reason. "The 17th verse says that grace and truth, *i.e.*, the full knowledge of God in contrast with the law both as to matter and form, has come by Jesus Christ. But it could only come to us through Him, because only a manifestation of God Himself could unveil the knowledge of God to human thought and Jesus Christ, as 'God only-begotten,' is this manifestation. The final thought of the Prologue runs thus: A historical person like Moses, Jesus Christ, has revealed and established on the earth the perfect knowledge of God, which is in contrast with the law in form and matter; He is, because man has never seen God, 'God,' uniquely and intimately united with God, from whom He springs, to whom He has returned, and with whom He dwells."

"This closing exposition of the Prologue is really both the heading and the theme of the following 'Gospel.' As the Logos is not again mentioned in the Prologue, so also in the Gospel; but what it asserts is really expounded in the following narrative. Looked at more closely, it contains in itself already a proof of the 'God only-begotten,' which seems to make all other proof superfluous. If it is certain that Jesus Christ has brought the perfect knowledge of God, it follows from the premise, No one has ever seen God, of strict necessity that He is Himself *Θεός*, and since He cannot be *ἀ-Θεός*, because He is a historical person, He must be *Θεός μονογενής*. Thus vers. 17 and 18 are complete in themselves." There is the following note on the phrase, "God only-begotten": "This phrase implies three things: (1) the Divine nature; (2) distinction from God and historical manifestation; (3) uniqueness. The Divine nature follows from the revealing of the truth, which, according to the Gospel, includes light, life, and all blessings; the historical manifestation is a fact; the uniqueness follows from His leaving even Moses far behind Him. It is certainly contended—and this applies also to the phrase 'only-begotten Son'—that the phrase involves historical manifestation. But no passage can be shown, either in the Prologue or the Gospel, in which Jesus Christ is considered as Son of God outside His historical manifestation." The Logos-idea is introduced as well known. The object is not to teach that there is a Logos, but to say what He is.



The emphasis in ver. 1 is on "in the beginning," "with God," and "God." Three things are said of Him: (1) He is God, and was in the beginning with God; (2) the relation of the world, which He made, to Him was a disturbed one; (3) He became flesh. The Gospel thus gives definiteness to our idea, before indefinite.

8. Let us gather up some of Dr. Harnack's conclusions. (1) The Evangelist cannot have been the first to apply the Logos-name to Jesus; otherwise, his introduction must have been different. (2) Why did he use it? Three answers are possible. Either to prepare Hellenistic readers to understand the person of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; or to correct the wrong conceptions of the identity of Jesus Christ and the Logos; or to give objective proof of the doctrine of Jesus Christ as pre-existent and born of God. The two former are not exclusive of each other, and are rendered probable by the Prologue. At the standpoint of a Hellenistic reader the Prologue reads naturally, advancing from the known to the paradoxical or more difficult, not, as it seems to us, the reverse way. And at the same time it looks as if the author, when he so carefully puts the Logos in the right relation to God and the world, must have had wrong views before his mind. The first epistle puts this beyond doubt. The third possibility is only plausible. If it had been the object, the Prologue must have had a different conclusion from vers. 14-18. Those addressed believed in the Logos; no objective proof was necessary; the question was as to the subject. The Gospel, too, gives no objective proof of the Sonship of Jesus from God. The Gospel does not conclude with the sentence, "that you may believe that Jesus is the Logos," but "the Christ, the Son of God." (3) Not only is the current idea of the Logos remodelled, but the person of Christ as "God only-begotten" is substituted for it. The previous exposition and the contents of the Gospel show this. Not that a right is substituted for a wrong view; but the definite for the indefinite. When the definite is reached, the indefinite disappears, as is the case in this Gospel. (4) This being so, it cannot be said that the Logos-doctrine is a "helping notion," or that it brings the Johannine teachings to unity. Not the first; for it is never used as a help. "It is rather supplied to the author, and he has used it to lead into the holy place of the Gospel, and so really as an introduction." Not the second, for the discourses of Jesus do not assume and develop it. "It reaches just to the point where the designation of the Redeemer as Jesus Christ and as 'God only-begotten' appears." The doctrine of the Gospel is not based on the idea. "How a Logos-doctrine looks may be seen from the apologists of the second century. How different is their theory of the world from that of the fourth Evangelist! For them only the Logos really exists, and Jesus Christ is one of His forms of manifestation, if they think it at all necessary to mention this form. For the Evangelist, on the other hand, Jesus the Christ, the Son of God, exists. Because he has drawn grace and truth from His fulness, he knows that this Jesus the Messiah is from above, *ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Because he knows this, he knows also that this Jesus existed before He came. Just for this reason, he can take up the speculation which others began and identify Him with the Logos. But he takes it up, because he can use it—correcting and remodelling it—as an introduction to what he has to proclaim about this Jesus: *that He is the Son of God*. Certainly, the Johannine theology has elements which are not historically intelligible without recourse to Hellenism; but whoever makes the Logos-doctrine the key to the fourth Gospel must first abstract from the discourses of Jesus in the Gospel a series of questions and problems, which the Evangelist himself either did not put or answered otherwise than with the help of that doctrine. He did not put them, because the peculiar nature of the heavenly Son of Man was not to him a

metaphysical problem, and because he could assert the being from God and pre-existence about Him without falling into philosophical scruples. . . . The Evangelist has not called the 'Word' the 'Son,' but he has so called Jesus, and has prepared for this designation by the other, 'the Word.' (5) According to Harnack, also, the sentence, "The Word became flesh," is not the ruling thought of the Gospel, as is often supposed. Its position is due to later controversies, which insensibly influence our reading of the Gospel. The dominant thought is rather, "The Son of Man is come from above"; "The Son was with God and came from God." "The declaration, The Word became flesh, is neither the explanation of that thought, nor does he repeat the ideas involved in it (he uses others in part), nor does he follow it up in any direction; whilst, on the other hand, he was simply compelled by his premisses to formulate it *once*. From the premisses, 'Jesus Christ is the Logos, and Jesus Christ is the historical manifestation which we have seen,' 'The Word became flesh' followed of necessity, especially when there were already those who divided the Redeemer's personality, acknowledging indeed the Logos in it, but not fully identifying this Logos with the historical manifestation. Nowhere does the fourth Evangelist exhibit anything of the amazed impression made on a later age by the saying, 'The Word became flesh'; nowhere does he present any formula deduced from it. Irenæus's dictum, 'He became what we are that we may become what He is,' does not lie in his range of vision. He has a similar thought, but it runs very differently: 'that they may be one as we are, that the love with which Thou lovedst me may be in them and I in them.'"

"The Prologue of the Gospel is not the key to understanding the Gospel, but prepares Hellenistic readers for it. It joins on to a well-known figure, the Logos, revises and re-models it, implicitly contesting mistaken Christologies, in order to substitute for it Jesus Christ, God only-begotten, or to exhibit it as this Jesus Christ. From the moment when this is done the Logos-idea is dropped. The author now only speaks of Jesus in order to establish the faith that He is the Messiah, the Son of God. This faith has for its chief article the confession, that Jesus springs from God and from heaven; but the author is far from any attempt to bring about this confession on cosmological and philosophical grounds. On the ground of His testimony to Himself, and because He has brought complete knowledge of God and life—purely supernatural, Divine blessings—Jesus, according to the Gospel, proves Himself the Messiah, the Son of God."

"A thought once uttered does not always operate simply in the direction and extent given it by its author, but by a logic of its own and its own inherent force. The thought, The Word became flesh, has had a history which did not begin in the intention of the fourth Evangelist. We do not, indeed, know what share the Prologue of the Gospel had in spreading and shaping the Logos-doctrine in the Church, as also we do not know who first identified the Messiah Jesus and the Logos; but even in the second century the fourth Gospel was not without influence on the reception and development of the doctrine, and soon the Gospel had to be read as to-day men think it must be read, as the Logos-Gospel. But in truth the Gospel contains no Logos-doctrine, but it exhibits the Logos as Jesus the Christ, the Son of God; it describes Him whom heathen, Jewish, and Christian philosophers thought they knew as the eternal Son of God, who is Jesus Christ."

It is scarcely probable that we shall ever have a better account of the Christology of the Ritschl school, or of the way in which that school understands the fourth Gospel, than Harnack here gives. It will perhaps be agreed that it is easier to say what is not than what is the view of that school on these subjects. The combination

in the foregoing article of high praise of the Gospel with disintegrating criticism is remarkable.

WAS THERE A PERSONAL PIETY IN EARLIER ISRAEL? By Dr. F. SCHNEIDERMAN, Leipzig (*Neue Kirchl. Zeitschrift*, 1893, No. 2).—"Psalm xviii. is to be understood throughout figuratively, not literally; the speaking I is the community, which expects, as a reward of its innocence and piety, the establishing of the Messianic kingdom by a theophany and the universal rule of Israel thus assured. These words of Cornill (Einleitung in d. A. T., S. 119) take us into the heart of what is at present a burning question of Old Testament research. A thoroughly *Biblico-theological* question emerges out of critical labour, and we may rejoice in the mere fact. The issue is nothing less than this: Can there have been in the time of the Kings a believing relation of an Israelite as an *individual* to Jehovah the God of revelation? We have hitherto assumed this; we have regarded it as no unhistorical proceeding to ascribe to an earlier Israelite an attitude of soul which put into his lips, as his personal confession, the words: 'I have set the Lord always before me; because He is at my right hand, I shall not be moved' (Ps. xvi. 8). This is expressly denied by the moderns; they think they have been driven, in the course of literary and historical study of the Old Testament, to the opposite view, namely, that the *nation* stands in covenant relation to Jehovah, and the individual is pious *only* in so far as he belongs to the nation and participates in the traditional or prescribed acts and duties of religion, *e.g.*, the feasts; subjectively pious, indeed, but not when he tests, seeks to gain, affirms *his own* salvation, *his own* drawing to God in repentance and faith (there was no such thing yet), but when the nation's need is his, the nation's deliverance his, the nation's great future hope his. In Smend (*Stade's Zeitschr.* viii.) this has led to an exposition of the Psalms standing in conscious opposition to all earlier exposition; this may be seen at once in the first Psalm: The man of whom it is said, 'Blessed is he who walks not,' &c., is the *community*, or congregation; therefore this Psalm stands at the head of the collection to be put into the lips of the community (of course, community of a later date)! Cornill speaks indeed of 'circles which cherished a piety after the pattern of the Psalms,' but who, according to him, the speaker in the Psalms is, we have just seen by the example of Ps. xviii. In the same way, in the case of the Song of the Bow (2 Sam. i.), that undoubtedly 'genuine relic of David's poetic activity,' he emphasizes the 'entire absence of the religious element.'"

The writer proceeds to test this statement about 2 Sam. i. "I should think the religious element was obvious enough in ver. 20: 'Tell it not in Gath,' &c. Certainly, not in the personal sense, but in the general, national sense. To David it is a bitter thought that triumphal songs will be heard among the heathen, all in scorn of Israel and of God, on whose revelation this nation lives. But the question is only whether such a piety, restricted as yet to the national limits, must not, when the experiences were of a personal kind, have borne the flower and fruit of a personal relation to Jehovah, in the first case, of course, in those who were naturally disposed to sympathize with others, and therefore according to all that we know of him in David. An eminent example in every sense is 2 Sam. vii. Inward piety must be ascribed to him if only on account of his words in ver. 2: 'Behold, I dwell in a house of cedar, and the ark of God dwells under curtains.' The opposite of everything artificial lies in these words; they do not sound like the outcome of a cool, politic consideration. The national element is not concealed; on the contrary, it forms the turning-point of the matter. How can it be fitting that the king should have a well-built palace (chap. v. 11), and on the other hand the ark of the covenant, that sign of

Jehovah's presence among His people, remain in a tent (vi. 17), since the king's highest distinction is to be permitted to dwell at the Lord's right hand (Ps. cx. 1)? But it is elevated into a personal attitude of soul to God; in connection with the temporal statement of ver. 1, which is not meant to be a mere date: 'When now the king sat in his house, and the Lord had given him rest from his enemies round about,' we get the impression of overflowing thankfulness in David to Him who had brought him to such a position; he is ashamed, God's goodness humbles him; by building a permanent abode he will satisfy an inner craving, and remove a state of things which he feels to be unworthy! On this it is to be further observed: his experience is not quite that of a simple Israelite who feels that he has been graciously led by God; what God has done to him He has done to him as the head of His people; here also the national medium is seen. But through this veil the rudiment of a truly personal relation appears.

"And is it not still more decisively seen in the conduct of David on the bringing up of the ark in chap. vi. ? We read there how David according to old custom dances before the Lord; how on this account he is exposed to the scorn of his wife, Michal, and how he replies by a joyous assertion of his inner attitude to God and of pious custom. I *will* be vile in my eyes; with intention and delight I have played before Jehovah, who has done so great things for me—if thy moral feeling is different, leave me mine! We see also that historically attested indications are not wanting that a different attitude might be taken. In Michal proud contempt for popular custom is stronger than gratitude to Jehovah; she shows want of piety. David, on the other hand, is glad to feel and show himself one with the people in devotion to Jehovah. And this history in 2 Sam. vi., according to Cornill, is 'very old,' even, in his opinion, a well-transmitted narrative standing near the events!

"Let us go still farther back. 1 Sam. iv., belonging to the second oldest source of 1 Sam., contains the glorious history of Eli's daughter-in-law, the wife of Phinehas. She was with child; she hears the news, that the ark of God has fallen into the hands of the enemy and Phinehas and Hophni are slain; her pangs come on her, she dies; but in her last conflict, when the women about her try to comfort her by saying, 'Thou hast brought a son into the world,' she puts all her remaining strength into a mournful song on her child; the song has but two words; it is the name she gives her child, and runs—I-chabod, the glory is no more; for, she added, the glory is gone from Israel, for the ark of God is taken. Unless the beginnings of personal piety are apparent here in the entire devotion of a soul to the fate of the people—and this in a woman—all moral and religious states of transition must be denied.

"To a woman, Hannah, the song 1 Sam. is ascribed; a woman, mother of Moses, is called Jochebed, Jehovah is glory; of a woman, Rebekah, in Gen. xxiv. an act is told which can only be explained as a cheerful, obedient compliance with Jehovah's will; it is not rash to say that women were expected to exert influence in the direction of a right attitude to Jehovah, which must then, through the natural temperament of women, have taken a leaning to the personal, however much the national form and limit remained. And by what means under Divine leading was the actual deeping into the personal brought about? We see no course open but to say: through the men, who heard a revelation like, 'The Lord looks at the heart,' the *prophets*. Samuel's saying, 'Obedience is better than sacrifice,' Nathan's still more personal saying, 'Thou art the man,' just the work and the significance of these older prophets needed a new, more thorough exposition. We have only sought to raise a brief protest against 'lowering the level of the pre-Exilic religion of the people of Israel.'"



DR. H. HOLTZMANN ON HARNACK (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1893, No. 4). —In Hilgenfeld's periodical Dr. Holtzmann reviews the article of Harnack summarized above. It is both interesting and instructive to hear one leader of advanced criticism on another. While agreeing, no doubt, in the final interpretation to be put on John's Gospel, Holtzmann traverses each one of the new positions taken up by Prof. Harnack.

1. Harnack limits the force of the designation "Son," "Son of God," to Christ's historical manifestation. Holtzmann, on the other hand, agrees with those, both of the orthodox and critical side, who find in the term the idea of identity of nature or origin within the Godhead. The use of "Son" in iii. 17, and of "only-begotten Son" in vers. 16 and 18, shows that the two terms are identical in meaning, the shorter form being Christ's, the longer the Evangelist's. Of course, there are not wanting orthodox expositors who refer the term Son to the historical Christ. Thus, Luthardt explains it of the fellowship of Jesus with the Father founded on His origin from God. Holtzmann quotes Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Scholten, Pfeiderer, Lipsius, as agreeing with Olshausen, Godet, Meyer, Keil in the meaning of the term, although, no doubt, the former would explain it of ideal, the latter of real existence.

Holtzmann observes that, with John's "being in God," derived causally from "being from God" (1 John v. 9), and this again from "begotten of God" (1 John iv. 7), we are at the heart of the Johannine "mysticism," which must not be resolved by the aid of the Pauline legal "adoption" into mere figure. Nor must the "seed of God" (1 John iii. 9) be explained by the "word of God" (1 Peter i. 23). Numerous passages in the first Epistle (ii. 29, iv. 7, v. 1, 4, 18) show how the idea is to be understood. "The Johannine 'birth from above' is indeed in substance akin to 'regeneration' (Titus iii. 5), and 'begotten again' (1 Peter i. 3, 23), perhaps based on the latter. It is distinguished, however, from the ideas mentioned in this, that these look back to a past state that is to be transformed, and hence lay the stress on the renewing in the birth; whereas John, so far as *ἀνωθεν* means 'from above,' takes into view the origin of those who are *ἐκ τῶν ὁθῶν* (viii. 23), the mode of their generation, but when it means 'again' merely refers to the beginning of life already found in the first birth." "John is the pioneer for those theological lines of thought which recognize a fertilizing of the human by the Divine Spirit, in virtue of which more is made of man, far greater things take place in man, than the idea of a natural being, however high his standing, would ever admit." We need not pursue further Holtzmann's own exposition.

2. Holtzmann also questions the position that no emphasis is to be placed on the second part of "only-begotten" (*μονογενής*). Harnack translates by "only-born." It is shown that the word has both shades of meaning, "only-begotten" and "only-born" (John i. 18). The use of *μονογενής* instead of Paul's *ὑποτρόχος* (Rom. viii. 29; Col. i. 15) confirms this. Both indeed express the thought of some relation, but the relation to the creature is less conspicuous in John's than in Paul's phrase. "The fourth Evangelist uses the term in the sense of a Son beside whom the Father has no other, or none else like the Father. Although the phrase serves to raise the 'only-begotten one' absolutely above the level of the 'children of God' (only this phrase, but not the equivalent 'sons of God,' which on the contrary is used only in the singular and reserved for Christ alone, is therefore taken from Paulinism), on the other hand it does not withdraw Him from all comparison with them. Rather a connection of the two ideas is discernible even in John, corresponding to the Synoptist connection between 'sons of God' and the Son preeminently. . . . The process of generation, which produces children of God in

abundance, will be carried out once in perfectly normal order and with perfectly normal result. This perfection of begetting, the uniqueness of the relationship existing between God and this absolutely normal result of the process, is exhibited in the name 'only-begotten.' The possibility of such a master-work, the crown of God's creative activity, is only understood in the context of the Prologue, that the Logos, who everywhere appears as mediator (i. 8), has effected something in this case unique of its kind—He Himself 'became flesh' (i. 14). If elsewhere He only works on creation, He this time places Himself in the created world; He is, so to speak, His own product, and as such is called 'the only-begotten.' If on such a background of thought the origin and use of our phrase appears intelligible, it is also evident that the idea of 'Son' is by no means synonymous with that of Logos, but only denotes that final stage of the movement at which the Logos above history becomes a historical being. He now lives in the form of a human consciousness knowing itself one with God. The begetting of a self-consciousness, such as is presented in the Johannine discourses of Christ, is the last act of the work of the Logos in the world." We do not wonder that Holtzmann goes on to argue at length in favour of Harnack's exclusion from the term "only-begotten" of all reference to any miraculous birth of Christ, or to the pre-temporal generation of the eternal Son.

8. Holtzmann differs further from Harnack in his suggestion that the idea of pre-existence is connected with the Messiahship of Jesus. If so, he says, it is strange that the idea does not appear in the Synoptists in the same connection. The pre-existence is, in fact, already implied in all that is said of the Logos (i. 1). It is thence transferred to the historical Messiah. Holtzmann thinks that a comparison of passages like i. 18, iii. 18, vi. 83, 88, 46, precludes the assertion that the Evangelist has not connected a real pre-existence with God with the name of Son. "On the contrary, to him Jesus, as a historical manifestation, is the Son absolutely, because the eternal relation of Logos stands behind the historical manifestation. To him the phrase, which links itself historically with the Messiah-idea, is explained and glorified in the light of the latter. . . . The name 'Son of God' is not to be understood merely as a Messianic title of honour, but can only be understood, without infringement of Christ's testimony in the entire Gospel, of the Divine Being, whose relation to God and the world has been already stated in the Prologue." For the rest, to Holtzmann, as to Harnack, Son of God and Messiah are equivalent.

4. Holtzmann also questions the statement that the fourth Gospel is not to be regarded as a "Logos-Gospel." The fact that Logos is used in the course of the Gospel in its ordinary sense or senses, of which so much is made, really makes no difference. "On the map of a spiritual territory it may happen that two places bear the same name; but they lie in different districts, and we do not lose the remembrance of the one when we come to describe the second. A poem, which in the preface speaks of the 'spirit' of the Middle Ages and professes to be written in this 'spirit,' is not untrue to itself, if here and there in the narrative a 'spirit' and 'spirits' play a part."

## CURRENT FRENCH THOUGHT.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE. By A. BOUVIER (*Revue Chrétienne*).—Few subjects force themselves on our attention in the present day with more pertinacity than that of the inspiration of the Bible—that is to say, of the presence and action of the Spirit of God in the Bible.

The word inspiration comes from *spirit* (*spiritus*, πνεῦμα), which properly signifies breath. So close is the connection between the two, that the Spirit of God is compared, in the conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus, to the wind, of which we do not know whence it comes or whither it goes. It is therefore a figurative expression, and, like all such when applied to things of the spiritual order, it only imperfectly sets forth the underlying idea. The action of a breath is external—it passes over the skin, it travels through an organ-pipe; and so, too often inspiration has been regarded as something that is external and superhuman in its operations. The Bible, it is true, has supplied a corrective to this misconception in the very multiplicity of the figures it uses for describing the work of the Spirit of God. In the history of creation the Spirit is compared to a brooding dove, by its kindly warmth kindling the germs of life; and the figure is recalled in the narrative of the baptism of Jesus, as if to intimate that the Spirit of God is about to bring forth a new moral world. Again, it is compared to a spring of living water, to the sap which flows from the vine-stock to the branches, and to a fire which both illuminates and cleanses; while the tongues of fire alighting on the heads of the Apostles are a vivid symbol of that fervid eloquence which was about to convert the world. So varied are the manifestations of the power of that Spirit which operates within the soul, and makes itself felt in and through the Sacred Scriptures. It is of its presence in the Scriptures that we have now to speak. The reality of the fact, and the nature of it, will engage our attention.

A fact is not proved by reasoning, but shows itself; it is attested by trustworthy evidence. In the case of inspiration, the fact is proved by a twofold testimony—that of the sacred writers themselves, and that of the Christian consciousness in its estimate of their writings and the impressions it has received from them. The prophetic writers of the Old Testament have full consciousness of their mission and calling. They feel and account themselves the interpreters of God—arrested, possessed, and impelled by a religious conviction which they wish to spread abroad. They present themselves as the messengers of God, and speak in His name. They tell us of special crises in their lives, and of prophetic dreams or visions; but they do not lay much stress upon these, they rather treat them as of secondary importance. The canonical prophets are quite aware that the false prophets have similar experiences. And in New Testament times the Apostles do not overvalue the merely external manifestations of inspiration. In 1 Cor. xiv. we see how St. Paul estimates the extraordinary gifts so highly valued in Corinth, and how he prefers to the ecstatic speaking with tongues the simple and persuasive word. A very significant circumstance in the experience of the prophets is their internal struggles. There is conflict between the Divine will and the human; the man is afraid, or timid, or divided between the Spirit which urges him on and the flesh which holds him back. The most striking example of this is that of Jeremiah, who cries, "His word was in mine heart, as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not contain." St. Paul in his turn says, "Necessity

is laid upon me: yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel." The prophets, it is to be remarked, always feel themselves able for their task; they are strengthened and endowed with energies of conscience, will, and love needed for the accomplishment of it. Who can have animated such lives, dictated such words, but the Spirit of God?

The second testimony is that of the religious consciousness—the testimony rendered by the Spirit of God who is in the believer to the Spirit of God who is in the Bible. The representation given by prophets and Apostles of the government of the world by God—of His supreme, unchanging rule, tempered by His righteousness and His mercy—and the passionate feelings of adoration, penitence, and love they express are full of a Divine life. And this life the Bible imparts—that is to say, it communicates to those who read it the holy passions by which it is animated.

From the testimony of the sacred writers and of the religious consciousness to the fact of inspiration we pass to the nature of that inspiration. It is not the mere transmission of a message—the carrying of a sealed letter by a man who may be deaf and blind, and yet none the less efficient as a messenger. No; the prophet is imbued with the Divine thought, he apprehends it, and makes it his own, substance of his substance, and soul of his soul; and then with all the energy of his being he communicates it, either as a spoken or as a written word. Inspiration is not only the act of God in him, but also a spontaneous and voluntary motion of his whole personality—religious, moral, intellectual, and physical—at least so far as visions and ecstasies are concerned. No infringement on human nature takes place; but a fuller, holier, and more perfect humanity is evoked—the life of the spirit is awakened or strengthened by communion with God. The inspiration which results from this is not something magical and superhuman, neither is it always of the same quality or intensity. It is subject to two conditions—to that of the epoch at which it occurs, and to that of the individuality of the man on whom it comes. Revelation—Divine truth—is progressive, and hence it follows that at such and such an epoch a certain truth is dimly perceptible to a few enlightened minds, which at a later time is common property, and is clear and intelligible to all. The great ones of the earlier era are thus surpassed by comparatively inferior personages in the era that follows. The lowliest in the kingdom of heaven knows more, and is therefore greater than John the Baptist. The second condition is that of the individuality of the prophet or apostle. There is diversity, and even inequality, in the gifts of inspiration. The thoughts of some who are inspired are greater than those of others; the knowledge of the Divine plan which some possess is deeper than that given to others. Surely the deuterо-Isaiah surpasses in this respect Obadiah and Haggai; St. Paul surpasses St. James. The mission of some is local, temporary, and Jewish; others, like Ezekiel, Daniel, and the author of the Apocalypse, have knowledge of the general destiny of nations and of mankind at large. Some are poetical and others are prosaic in their diction; some are distinctly original, others are imitators; the modes of thought of the priest or of the layman influence the form in which this prophet or that states his message. Individuality is not suppressed by inspiration; it receives an elevation of tone, but is not abolished.

The question naturally arises, Is inspiration confined to Israel and to the Bible? My firm opinion, which is based on the teaching of the Bible itself, is that it is not. The activity of the same Spirit which inspired the Bible has ever been manifest in the Church and in humanity. The prophet Joel anticipated the coming of a time when the gifts of the Spirit, which were then the possession of a limited class, would be poured out upon all—upon young and old, bond and free. And on the day of Pentecost St. Peter announced that the prophecy had then begun to receive its



fulfilment. In the fourth Gospel, in like manner, Jesus promises the Spirit to guide, and comfort, and teach all who believe in Him. And the Apostles declare that the Churches they have founded have received the Spirit, that all faith and life and energy and knowledge are His gifts. It would be arbitrary in the highest degree to assert that inspiration was the exclusive privilege of one nation of antiquity—of the nation which crucified Jesus, and drove the Apostles out of its community. The Book of Genesis represents the Spirit of God as the active power in the creation of the world, and Ps. civ. speaks of that Spirit as the principle of animal life. It can scarcely be erroneous, therefore, to think of the Spirit as the author of all that is true and noble in the religions and civilizations of the world. The Book of Exodus ascribes to Him the genius and skill of the workmen who constructed the Tabernacle; the Book of Judges represents the physical strength of Samson and the military prowess of Othniel and Jephthah as proceeding from Him. And should we be afraid to ascribe to the same source the profoundly religious genius of a Michael-Angelo, a Guido, a Bach, a Handel, a Lesueur, a Thorwaldsen, or a Scheffer, or the martial courage which St. Louis, Coligny, Gustavus Adolphus, and Washington consecrated to holy causes? All that is true and holy and inspiring must come from the one Divine source; and to desire to limit the inspiration of God to one age or people or book, is a kind of unbelief in God—it is to set bounds to His power and love, and to impoverish the world, which is already too sorely enfeebled by the inroads of sin.

## CURRENT DUTCH THOUGHT.

ANTHROPOLOGY, AND ITS PLACE IN DOGMATICS. By Dr. F. E. DAUBANTON (*Theologische Studiën*, 11<sup>de</sup> jaarg., afl. 1, 1893).—If the weight and importance of a science depends upon its object, then the first place is assured to anthropology among the sciences of created things. The cosmos constitutes a hierarchically ordered system. On all hands each lower form of existence in the economy of the world finds its destination and goal in a higher form. At the head of the whole organization, and uniting it to a higher world, stands man. Man, in fact, exercises upon earth a lordship that no other creature does. He reflects upon the facts that slumber or are active in nature. He wakens them out of their slumber. He discovers the laws to which they are obedient. He takes advantage of both for the attainment of his ends, whether they be near at hand or remote. The creature named man is unique. He is different from, and more excellent than, all the others. It may be asserted that man in the condition in which we now find him, and as represented in ourselves, is a fallen monarch. But it must be confessed that the fallen one is still a monarch. There are atrocities and misdeeds associated with humanity to which the lower animals can never fall; but the tragical working and development of sin confirms the proverb: *Corruptio optimi pessima*.

From whatever point of view the scientific inquirer studies man he invariably finds in him the noblest object that creation reveals. The advocate of the theory of evolution will place the best developed anthropoid below the *homo sapiens*, although he may think that the difference between the two is merely one of degree. Whatever functions the lower animals may, to a certain extent, have in common with man, the philosophy of religion finds nothing to its taste in the animal world. There is no such thing as a religious beast. The religious moral life is the distinguishing

characteristic of man. It defines the boundary line that is drawn between the animal kingdom and humanity. "The world is a temple of God," says Hase, "but the first to recognize and consecrate it as such is its priest—he who worships in the temple—namely, Man."

No wonder, then, that the noblest and deepest of thinkers, struck with the unique place of man in creation, have also recognized the unique importance of anthropology in the domain of science. Upon the *ἱερόν τεῖνον* inscribed above the entrance of the temple of Helios the history of human thought has impressed its seal. *ἱερόν τεῖνον* was the motto of Socrates; and the sway of the nature-philosophy of his time saw its days numbered. At the bottom, the *doute méthodique* of Cartesius is nothing else than a modified form of *ἱερόν τεῖνον*; and *Cogito ergo sum* inaugurated a new period in the history of philosophy. If the name of Kant indicates a turning-point in the further development of philosophy, subjective idealism, showing the importance of the thought categories, returns in the end again to that old, that ever new, *ἱερόν τεῖνον*.

It is not, however, the heroes of philosophy only who have laid emphasis on the importance of anthropology. In the beginning of Book II. of his *Institutes*, Calvin says, "It was not without reason that the ancient proverb so strongly recommended to man the knowledge of himself. For if it is deemed disgraceful to be ignorant of things pertaining to the business of life, much more disgraceful is self-ignorance, in consequence of which we miserably deceive ourselves in matters of the highest movement, and so walk blindfold."

Now, anthropology, as a chapter of dogmatics, views man as a religious moral being in his relation to God. The calling of the medical physiologist is one, that of the philosophical psychologist is another; and yet another is that of the dogmatist. We have to attend to the highest, the noblest life-functions and relations of man; to those, in fact, that make him man. We have to describe the present condition of man as a religious moral being, and in order to do this thoroughly we have first of all to find out how this condition became what it now is. Thus, all that is adduced to demonstrate the importance of anthropology in general applies *a fortiori* to the science of man as a religious moral being in particular.

We must, however, indicate more precisely the task of the dogmatist when dealing with anthropology. The distinction between his work and that of the philosopher of religion must not be lost sight of. This last goes at once to the object of his study. He has to study the religious moral man directly, just as he now presents himself; and, according to the requirements of the historical method, he has to seek indirectly for an answer to the question: What was man formerly, and how came he to be what he now is? The philosopher of religion gives us his opinion, the result of his observation, of his research, and, more intimately, of his experience. The dogmatist, on the other hand, finds his material historically supplied in the teaching of his Church. It is this that he has to bring out, to estimate critically, to develop, and to work into a system. This distinction between the work of the two must be carefully kept in mind, in order that no confusion may arise. It is not what A or B thinks about man, but what his Church, by the mouth of its official interpreters, confesses, that is the basis of the dogmatist's operations. That is what he has to deal with, in accordance with the demands of science, and in harmony with the intellectual development of his Church during the period now current.

If anthropology, regarded by itself, is, on account of its object, of the highest importance, it is of preponderating importance in dogmatics. Whoever has thoroughly studied and mastered the anthropology of any particular system of

dogmatics is already in possession of the main data upon which to pass judgment on its theology, in its narrower sense, and on its soteriology. An Augustinian soteriology cannot accompany a Pelagian anthropology. A hamartiology, constructed in the spirit of the rationalistic "Aufklärung," can never be brought into harmony with the soteriology, say, of Calvin. Whoever carefully examines the various methods employed in the history of doctrine and of dogmatics will readily recognize the influence of anthropology on all the other branches of the doctrinal system.

As to the place of anthropology in the dogmatic system, the history of dogmatics teaches that writers on the subject have not been unanimous; but the great majority of reformed dogmatists have begun their exposition of doctrine with theology in its narrower sense. Thus, most of the symbolical writings of the Protestant Churches begin with the confession of faith concerning the Divine Being. To this the Heidelberg Catechism is a noteworthy exception, inasmuch as it places anthropology first, although with special reference to hamartiology. From this it appears clear that the whole design of the Catechism has been projected on an anthropological plan. The beginning of Calvin's Catechism is also anthropological. In the first edition of his *Loci*, Melancthon started with man, his free will and his need of redemption. The later editions begin with the chapter *De Deo*. The first book of the *Institutes* of the Genevan reformer treats "Of the knowledge of God the Creator." It is, however, necessary to remark, in order to a right understanding of this fact, that the first chapter of the first book is entitled "The knowledge of God and of ourselves mutually connected.—Nature of the connection." Calvin recognizes that "it is not easy to determine which of the two precedes and gives birth to the other," and he concludes that "every person, on coming to the knowledge of himself, is not only urged to seek God, but is also led as by the hand to find Him."

On the ground of these and suchlike explanations one might too readily expect that the thoughtful Reformer had begun with the exposition of anthropology. This, however, is not so. With an "on the other hand," he introduces considerations that must necessitate the previous treatment of the knowledge of God. "It is evident," he says, "that man never attains to a true self-knowledge until he has previously contemplated the face of God, and come down after such contemplation to look into himself. For (such is our innate pride) we always seem to ourselves just, and upright, and wise, and holy, until we are convinced, by clear evidence, of our injustice, vileness, folly, and impurity." And so Calvin concludes that though the knowledge of God and the knowledge of ourselves are bound together by a mutual tie, due arrangement requires that we treat of the former in the first place, and then descend to the latter.

In order to judge of the lawfulness of Calvin's conclusion, we must first read chapter xv. of the first book of the *Institutes*. This chapter treats of the "State in which man was created. The faculties of the soul, the image of God, free will, original righteousness." The fact that this chapter forms part of the book devoted to the knowledge of God the Creator is noteworthy. Calvin at once explains that, "We cannot clearly and properly know God unless the knowledge of ourselves be added." Whoever examines the matter carefully will admit that Calvin's conclusion—first theology, then anthropology—requires to be supported by weightier arguments.

The Reformed dogmatists, after Calvin, give theology the first place. The majority of the Lutherans do the same. The history of dogmatics show this, and against this testimony there is nothing to be adduced. Dr. Van Oosterzee, the latest of the Reformed divines in Holland who gave to the world a complete system

of dogmatics, adhered to the traditional arrangement. But the reasons given by Van Oosterzee for placing theology before anthropology are just as little convincing as are those of Calvin.

We are of opinion that in the dogmatic system anthropology must be treated first, before theology, for various reasons. This arrangement is the only one that corresponds to the method of science and to our advancement in conscious life. It is clear that, in the first place, we have no conception of what is outside us, but only of our self. And science does not first know causes; but rather the consequences first, and the causes afterwards. From the known effects it ascends to the causes—from the creature to the creator. The objection that by this arrangement God is not honoured as the Alpha and the Omega possesses more of the rhetorical power of carrying away than the scientific weight of conviction. To reach the first principle of all that exists is the end of science, not its first beginning. Another objection to this arrangement is that it is a departure from Reformed theological tradition, and that the Reformed type of doctrine is thereby subverted. To this twofold objection there is the twofold answer—yes and no. It is true that it is a departure from the order cherished by the Reformed dogmatists, as may be seen by a glance at the works of Voetius, Marck, and Brakel. But we deny that it is a subversion of the Reformed type of doctrine, or that it runs counter to its principle and tendency.

To return to Calvin, his masterly work, the *Institutes*, is not arranged according to the later scheme—theology, anthropology, soteriology, &c.—but according to the fourfold division, “Of the knowledge of God the Creator; of God the Redeemer; of the mode of obtaining the grace of Christ; of the external means or helps by which God allures us into fellowship with Christ and keeps us in it.” This is practically the incorporation of the Trinitarian division with a broadly-developed ecclesiology. Where is anthropology to be found here? Why does it not obtain an independent place in the scheme? He who studies the *Institutes* thoughtfully will see that the whole work is in reality a great anthropology. Calvin reasons from the standpoint of the Christian personality. His anthropology was already cut and dry before he committed a line of his theology to paper. It is the basement that carries the whole structure. That the anthropological principle did not receive its due place in the external arrangement of the *Institutes* shows that Calvin, a child of the age in which he lived, very surely succumbed to the influence of tradition in formal matters.

What the Reformed type of doctrine asks to be recognized is that in divinity man is the minor subject. It is a question of quality, and not one of order. Even Romish, Lutheran, Remonstrant, and Socinian systems began with theology in the limited sense. The whole question here discussed narrows itself down in the end to this: Will you present your doctrinal system in an inductive-genetic form, or in a deductive form?

DANCING. By REV. N. A. DE GAAY FORTMAN (*Tijdschrift voor de Gereformeerde Theologie*, Jan., 1893).—Taken in its simplest and most natural significance, dancing is nothing more than the expression of joyful or sorrowful emotions by means of gestures and rhythmical movements regulated by the laws of æsthetic feeling. As regards its origin, Suicerus explains it very simply when he says that “when men are deeply moved, both in mind and body, whether by things sorrowful or joyful, they execute different movements and gestures by the impulse of nature alone. Then art comes in, and by it the movements and gestures of the body are made regular and harmonious.” This explanation, which is not improbable, also accounts for the fact that dancing from of old has been practised by the people of God as well as by those of the world. The heathen danced to the honour of their deities; they had no



religious solemnities or feasts without dancing. And the Israelites likewise expressed their joy for the great favours of God by dancing. So we read in God's Word of David that he leaped and danced before the ark of the Lord. The daughters of Shiloh also came out to dance at a feast of the Lord, when the Benjamites fell upon them and took them away as wives. Likewise, Miriam the prophetess and all the women went out with timbrels and with dances while they sang a song of triumph to the Lord. Of Jephthah's daughter we also read that she came out with her companions to meet her father with timbrels and with dances. Stranger still is the testimony of Jesus in the parable of the Prodigal Son, whose return was celebrated with music and dancing.

That this dancing was subject to rules, and thus had been learned beforehand, is perfectly clear from its being always accompanied with music, playing, and singing. Alongside these sacred dances there were also, in ancient times, private dances. The heathen had stage, war, and festal dances. These did not exist among the Israelites, although, to be sure, they danced at family and national festivities. Jesus alludes to a marriage custom of the Jews, which the children imitated, when He says, "They are like unto children sitting in the market-place, and calling one to another, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced." The women also came out singing and dancing to meet Saul and David after the slaughter of Goliath and the Philistines. This last sort of dancing, however, readily degenerated into a species of worldly and voluptuous dancing, of which we have a specimen in the dancing of the daughter of Herodias.

At the present day, dances are of two kinds—society dances or balls, and stage or theatrical dances. These dances are taken part in by men and women together; which was not the case in ancient times, when men and women appear to have danced separately, notwithstanding the different interpretation put by some upon Psalm lxviii. 25. Be that as it may, a more important question for Christians to decide is whether or not dancing is lawful on the basis of God's Word. Naturally, the so-called sacred dances of David, Miriam, and others were lawful; but as they no longer exist, it is needless to speak of them: we confine ourselves to private dances. That the Christians of the first two centuries, in the midst of persecutions, thought little or nothing about dancing we can easily conceive. With the dawn of quieter times, however, dancing came into fashion; but the Church did not favour the practice, and the Council of Laodicea forbade dancing at marriages. The Council of Agatho, held in 450, also forbade, as a general rule, all Christians to take part in dances accompanied with frivolous songs. And the most famous of the Church-fathers—such as Basil, Ambrose, Gregory of Nazianzen—spoke to the same effect. But when the world again triumphed in the Church, dancing under all sorts of forms was declared to be lawful by many divines. The Reformation condemned dancing wholly and utterly, at least, as far as Calvinism is concerned, for the Lutherans had fewer difficulties in permitting it. There were exceptions, however, among the Calvinists. Peter Martyr and Danaeus taught that dancing, when properly regulated, was permissible and harmless. Marnix van St. Aldegonde went a step further, and while condemning sinful dancing, held private and society dancing to be perfectly harmless, and joined in it himself as often as he had the opportunity. Other zealous Christian writers are known to have shared his opinions, among whom was the celebrated professor of law at Franeker, Ulricus Huber, who maintained that the merry musical dance was a preventive of drinking and a means of improving the behaviour of young people.

But, after all, the defenders of dancing form but a small circle compared with

the long list of its opponents. Among these there is not one who does not admit that if it were nothing more than the expression of feeling (as it was among the Israelites at the time of their spiritual maturity) or a gymnastic exercise, there would be no complaint to make against it; but this is nowhere the case. Udemans says rightly that dancing means men with women and youths with maidens frivolously leaping and skipping to the enjoyment of the flesh. Joh. Taffinus writes to the same effect, and Amesius also condemns all such dances as lead to merely carnal pleasure. This definition of dancing is neither new nor specially Christian. Among the Romans even there were those who condemned dancing, although, like other nations, they honoured their deities with dances. Lucius Lucinus Murena, consul in the year 62 B.C., was accused by Cato of being a dancer, whereupon his advocate, Cicero, did not seek to defend dancing. On the contrary, he condemned it, and maintained that his client could not be a dancer because dancing is always accompanied by other vices. "For it may be said that no one ever dances when sober, unless he be perchance a madman, nor will any one dance alone, nor in a moderate and sober party, but dancing is the last companion of prolonged feasting, of luxurious situation, and of many refinements." Again, in the oration for King Deiotarus, Cicero asks, "Did any one ever see Deiotarus dancing—did any one ever see him drunk?" And in his *Offices* Cicero indicates that dancing was esteemed but a scandalous practice, and unbecoming a sober and prudent person among the Romans. As Cicero judged, so also did Sallust, who, in his *Conspiracy of Catiline*, remarks of a certain lady named Sempronia that "she could sing, play, and dance with greater elegance than became a woman of virtue," thereby placing dancing among the instruments of luxury. And, to name only another, the historian Justin tells that timbrels and dances were introduced as ministrations to the luxury of Ptolemy Philopater. Why the Romans so strongly condemned dancing is explained to us by the Apostle Paul in the Epistle to the Romans ii. 14, 15: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." They have shown that they had the work of the law written on their heart, although very faintly. We, on the contrary, have the Word of God, written by the Holy Ghost, from which it appears clear to us what the Lord has said regarding dancing in His Word. Various considerations lead to the conclusion that dancing is one of the things that have had their origin in the world, and that it is to be avoided both on account of what it leads to and because it is not a good thing in itself. Everything warns us that we must avoid and escape from it, even although there is no passage of Scripture in which it is explicitly forbidden.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The type of thought illustrated in this abstract is somewhat prevalent among a considerable section of the Dutch people, and there appears to be a tendency to carry its practical application beyond reasonable limits. Thus some would make it unlawful for Christians to join in any amusement that is calculated to lead to physical or moral injury. During the past winter the propriety of concert-going, and even of skating, has been seriously discussed, the latter being held by a few to be a breach of the sixth commandment on account of the number of fatal accidents to which it leads. Dr. Kuyper, the leader of the ultra-orthodox or Calvinistic party, and editor of *De Heraut van de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland*, has summed up against concert-going, but has pronounced skating to be a legitimate pastime, if due precautions are taken for the safety of those indulging in it. This latter decision has not given satisfaction to some of his followers, but he very properly reminds such, in the words of Paul, that if everything is to be forbidden that is capable of being perverted, "Then must ye needs go out of the world." That the same tendency to unnecessary strictness in the matter of amusements

## CURRENT SCANDINAVIAN THOUGHT.

PONTIFEX MAXIMUS. By SIGURD ISEN (*Nyt Tidsskrift*, new series, No. 1).—The Roman Pontiff knows no equal; he claims to stand over all other monarchs, and yet no one bears a more humble title than the one he pleases to give himself—*Servus Servorum Dei*. His coronation is celebrated with imperial splendour, and yet as he is borne up to the altar of St. Peter's the melancholy words of the Latin psalm are sung—*Sic transit gloria mundi*. From this moment he becomes the spiritual head of two hundred million souls, but at the same time he sacrifices the personal freedom which is enjoyed by the meanest of those who listen to his command.

The Pope calls himself the Vicegerent of Christ, but his official title—*Pontifex Maximus*—he has received from godless emperors, who in their turn have inherited it from the high priests of polytheism. The triple crown that rests upon his head is supposed to be the emblem of his power in the suffering, the militant, and the conquering Church, but in reality this golden tiara had its origin among the Persian kings. Its counterpart was borne by Cyrus and Cambyzes long before the Gospel had assembled a congregation. He is the representative of a Lord who has said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and, nevertheless, he sets up as a worldly potentate, with all the attendant pomp and outward show of royalty.

Catholicism is not, like Protestantism, split up into churches or sects confined to localities, and independent of each other. It is one and indivisible; the greatest "international" the world has seen. It may be said to be the dominant confession in Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, and Belgium, in Mexico, in the Central and South American Republics. It is the prevailing doctrine in Austria-Hungary, Poland, and Ireland. It embraces a third of the population of the German Empire. It has numerous followers in Turkey, in Switzerland, in Holland, in the United States, and in Canada. It has missionaries in the most distant regions; in China, in Polynesia, in the heart of Africa. And it is always making new proselytes. While Lutheranism stands still, or rather goes back, the Catholic Church gains ground. No wonder; for it understands how to ensnare souls as no other does. With psychological insight it appeals to men's senses and feelings. Art in all its forms is made use of. It extends its influence into everyday life. The Catholic clergy, much more thoroughly than the evangelical, assume control of their flocks, and imbue them with their thought and action. They do this the more easily as the steadily enforced principle of authority in the Romish Church gives the priesthood unbounded influence over the uncultured laity.

Catholicism is concentrated in the residence of the Pope. From all countries the countless threads of its interests meet in the Vatican. Here, affairs of the most diverse kinds are settled, private and public, political and religious, small and great, from simple affairs of divorce up to questions of concordats and dogmas. By the side of the absolute priest-king stands as a sort of ministerial council the "Sacred College" of Cardinals. In this the foremost place is held by the prelate who, under the title of Secretary of State, takes charge of the Papal diplomacy. For with the loss of its territory, the Papacy has not ceased to be regarded as a personality in

is not unknown in the United States is evident from a recent utterance in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, to the effect "that it seems inherent in systems of general recreation, no matter how wisely planned or carefully conducted, to degenerate."—J. M. A.

international law. And as such it not only receives the ambassadors and envoys of foreign powers, but it in turn has its representatives in foreign countries. Readers of the leading journals cannot fail to notice the important rôle played by the Papal diplomatists. Again and again they will meet with the names of Rampolla, Galimberti, Czacki, Ruffo-Scilla, Agliardi.

In point of fact, the Vatican and its agents interfere in the relations of most European kingdoms. The necessity of keeping the heterogeneous masses of the faithful together under a common law and a common government; the fundamental principal of Catholicism—that of intermeddling with purely secular affairs—and thence its claim to have the school system in its hand—considerations such as these account for the fact that the Romish Church cannot rest contented with the subordinate position which Protestantism is ready to put up with. Wherever it has found entrance it seeks to be recognized as a kind of separate state, as far as possible independent of the civic community. This explains why it is that the Papacy is perpetually embroiled either in disputes or in negotiations with temporal powers.

All this has been conspicuous under Leo XIII. In the fourteen years of his pontificate we have seen how the "Kulturkampf," which embittered the last days of Pius IX., has, bit by bit, resulted in the retreat of the governments of Central Europe. In Switzerland the Federal Council had to condescend to repeal its decree of expulsion against the refractory Mermillod, and to reinstate Lachat in his episcopal authority. In Belgium the interrupted diplomatic relations with the Holy See were resumed, and the Liberal school law of the Frère-Orban's ministry had to give place to a new one that has brought elementary education under priestly control. In Austria the ecclesiastical princes were allowed to behave as if the concordat which had been renounced in 1870 henceforth remained in force. In Prussia the embassy at the Vatican, which had formerly been withdrawn, has again been restored, the vacant bishoprics have, one after another, been filled, the hostile "May Laws" have been modified to the advantage of the Catholic priesthood. In the German Parliament the Ultramontane party has, since the seventies, risen from a membership of 68 to 106, and its influence on the measures of the government has been so often and so forcibly felt that Prince Bismarck, without meeting with specific contradiction, has been able to maintain that the present guiding force in Germany is simply the tow-line of the clerical party.

These are great results, but with these Leo XIII. does not rest content. He aims at the restoration of his temporal dominion, of that church-state of which his predecessor was robbed by Victor Emmanuel. Hence his enmity to the royal house of Savoy, his opposition to the Triple Alliance, of which it is a member, his favour for a union between France and Russia, who, in a coming war, shall crush the confederacy of the three powers, and compel Italy to deliver up its Roman province. In the Liberal organs a new *dominium temporale* is depicted as a dream. But, in the eyes of the faithful, there is nothing impossible for this Papal power that has already returned from Avignon and Fontainebleau, and has survived Attila and Bonaparte.

**MATERIALISM AND NATURAL SCIENCE.** By Prof. SOPHUS TORUP (*Nyt Tidsskrift*, new series, No. 3).—If a historian of civilization in the year A.D. 2500 should endeavour to form for himself an idea of the general cast of thought in this, the last decade of the nineteenth century, and if he should seek to do this by a study of the popular, non-technical, periodical press, he would so often come upon the words "materialism" and "materialistic view of life," that he would undoubtedly reach the conclusion that the universal conception of existence, as well among plain as among cultured people, was materialistic. And he would be particularly



struck with the fact that, in this present year, in public discussions, words should be used and notions propounded, as if every one understood them, which, as he would express it, "we, after the lapse of seven hundred years, are even yet completely ignorant of, and which the science of the last seven centuries, in spite of its great progress, has sought in vain to explain."

As a matter of fact, has so mighty a stream of materialism run through the culture of the last decades as to explain and justify the extensive use of these dangerous words? Certainly not. But, it may be asked, are not the natural sciences—the favoured offspring of the century—vehicles of materialism? Are they not its very incarnation? And the doctrine of evolution and modern physiology, together with the physiology of mind and experimental psychology—are these not just so many fortresses from which materialism digs its trenches and undermines the social and moral ground upon which we live? By no means. But even if it were really so, even if the modern natural sciences and the culture they represent were materialistic, is it the same "materialism" and the same "materialistic view of life" that are now dinned into our ears from every side, and that are bandied about in journalistic skirmishes and in parliamentary pitched battles? Does this every-day significance of the word materialism coincide with that of science? By no means; they are as different as night and day. But that, probably, does not matter; it is not the first time that a thing has been misunderstood. It is merely a repetition of the old story, that before a thing is quite comprehended a name for it crops up, but just as likely as not it is the wrong one. That would not matter much if the unintelligible word did not, as is always the case, by degrees begin to clothe itself with flesh and blood, and to pose as something real, and in that way to do harm.

It is right and proper to endeavour to check this, to try to show that what one begins to understand by "materialistic view of life" by no means coincides with "materialism" in its actual and scientific sense. It is further desirable to show that natural science, and especially the science which this question touches most closely, namely physiology, is not materialistically disposed as materialism is popularly understood. The misunderstanding has already been hurtful to the natural sciences, and goes a long way to account for the fact that natural science as a basis of education and culture has been received with mistrust and aversion.

Since Copernicus set the earth revolving in the heavens, it seems as if to the eyes of science the world had been awakened from an enchanted sleep. To the eyes of Huygens light became a motion—a vibration of ether atoms. Tyndall saw that heat is simply a particular "mode of motion"; and to Clerk Maxwell's ingenious gaze electricity and magnetism revealed themselves in turn as motion—as vibrations of ether atoms. But this development, which, little by little, has shown that behind the old forces of nature there is concealed a world of vibrating, pulsating atoms, does not stop there. It is not merely the forces of nature that show themselves to be forms of motion, but even the general properties of matter are the result of the activities of atoms. Some of these properties have obtained a dynamic explanation. Lord Kelvin has already made ingenious contributions to the understanding of the elasticity of bodies "as possibly a mode of motion." And the well-known Russian chemist, Mendeléeff, has attempted to bring chemical transformations and reactions within range of similar points of view. It is only a question of time when universal attraction and when qualitative differences of the elements will find the same explanation. It is probably spectrum analysis that will show the way. Inorganic nature which for the ancients was lifeless, dead, exhibits itself to us as a world full of life, peopled by working atoms. The old distinction

between living and lifeless must cease, for all alike are living. It is true that the exact demonstration of all this still lies in the future. Perhaps the whole life of the human race upon earth may be too short for a full mastery of it; but there is nothing to prevent it from being done. That being so, has materialism triumphed? Is the modern study of nature in its essence materialistic? By no means, for this is not materialism. Materialism is a manner of regarding the world, and it must, if it is to have a *raison-d'être* at all, stretch forth over everything. It must gather under its observation psychical as well as physical phenomena, and all without exception; and it must render an account of everything as an outcome of matter and its motion.

The old naïve materialism could not, from the nature of the thing, have its eye open to the difficulties that rose round an attempt to force its way in among psychical processes. The natural sciences were too slightly developed; they lacked first and foremost the experimental method. It is that which places a gulf between the natural sciences of classical antiquity and ours. When experimental research at the beginning of this century built as if it were by magic the Aladdin castle of the modern natural sciences, it was to be expected that materialism should feel the time had come in which to erect a tower whence man should overlook the universe. But the efforts of Vogt, Moleschott, and Büchner were vain, and during the last twenty years materialism has lived, like an exiled monarch, in the quiet retreat that is reserved for it in the history of philosophy. It is only now and then called forth to serve as a target for combative philosophers and theologians who seek to win their spurs as knights of the transcendental world by an onslaught upon the poor unfortunate—and the exploit is not a dangerous one.

It is the newer physiology of the senses that has set the question as to natural science and materialism in its true light, and squared up accounts between the two. There are forms of motion for whose apprehension we do not possess in the smallest degree the organ of sense. There are motions which on that account entirely escape our notice, and which we are thus not in a position to gauge. There may also be forces in nature of which we have no conception. There may be activities the amount of which we cannot determine. We know that it is so; the proofs are not far to seek. In our investigations of nature we reach a point beyond which we cannot go for want of the means of further apprehension. The study of nature has found no means of overcoming this. Even the smallest psychical process may be for ever incomprehensible because our organization either lacks the means of apprehending it, or, to put it more plainly, because the necessary organ of sense is wanting.

And if it is true that we, even in our highest development, can only apprehend motions and transpositions of motions; and if it is true that behind certain of these motions—those, namely, that take place in our own organism—there are psychical processes of which we know nothing; then the question arises, Is it not possible that, in like manner, psychical processes lie behind the other molecular movements in the world, which for us differentiate themselves in nothing from those that take place in our own bodies? When the molecules of the magnet revolve in mighty tempests under the influence of an electric current; when the eight hundred million million vibrations of light in a second resolve the bromide of silver into its constituent parts; when the iron is drawn towards the magnet with irresistible force, are not psychical processes lying at the back of this? We have no right to deny the possibility of it. The question cannot be brushed aside with the statement that psychical processes must be associated with a nerve-cell. We know, not only a series of polycelled animals without a nervous system, but also single-celled organisms in which life

manifests itself in a way that is usually regarded as standing in connection with psychical processes. We cannot deny, says Engelmann, who has studied these creatures, "that these circumstances point to psychical processes in the protoplasm." They are in every case movements and processes of the kind which, if they happened in the case of man, we would without hesitation explain as springing from psychical motives. On the other hand, physiologists will recognize the difficulty of a purely mechanical explanation of these conditions.

The modern study of nature is not materialistic: it is much rather inclined to see everywhere in the universe the outcome of life, even in cases where it is overlooked by idealism. It knows that that which is contemptuously called dead nature possesses forces and movements as complex and manifold as life itself. It will not even go the length of denying that there is a possibility that behind these movements there lie psychical phenomena. But it knows that this can never become a subject for observation: it forbids even the assumptions of the human understanding. It is the duty of every naturalist and of every man to form his own opinion as to the relation of the psychical processes to the mechanical phenomena of motion, in accordance with the depth of the knowledge that he owes to the laws of nature.

## THE BOOK CRITIC.

THE BOOKS OF EZRA AND NEHEMIAH (CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES). By H. E. RYLE, B.D. Messrs. Clay & Sons.

The student of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah could desire no more judicious and adequate guidance than Professor Ryle's commentary, which has the rare merit of being at once concise and clear, compact and comprehensive. There are more ponderous commentaries in English on these two books, but none that we know of so satisfactory from all points of view. It equals the German work of Bertheau-Ryssel, and more could scarcely be said of it. A commentator on Ezra and Nehemiah has to deal with a variety of problems, historical, literary, textual, and grammatical. He has to begin by disintegrating his materials, assigning to the memoirists their part, and to the compiler his. He has to place a section of Jewish history against the broad background of a period of world-history, and to read into the two books many things which they do not explicitly tell. He has frequently to balance probabilities, in the absence of any statement of facts. He has, besides, in numerous passages, to reconstruct a corrupt text, and elucidate an obscure meaning. His work thus gives scope both for the historical instinct and the critical faculty, and in neither does Professor Ryle come short.

Turning, as one naturally does, to some of the *cruces* which the two books present, we notice that Professor Ryle is disposed to maintain the identity of Sheeshbazzar and Zerubbabel (p. 12), while allowing their full weight to arguments on the other side. Also, that he places the important section, Ezra iv. 7-23, in its true historical sequence (p. 64). Canon Rawlinson is of opinion that "the 'Artaxerxes' of Ezra iv. 7-23 can only be Pseudo-Smerdis" (*Ezra and Nehemiah: Men of the Bible Series*, p. 99). Professor Ryle gives excellent reasons for supposing the contrary. He takes the common-sense view that the names of Persian kings in that section mean there what they mean elsewhere; in which he has on his side the authority of Professor Kuenen, who remarks pithily—in one of his latest works, the *Chronologie van het Persische Tijdvak der Joodsche Geschiedenis*—that "names serve not to

conceal persons or things, but rather to reveal them." From the Note on Ezra ix. and x. (p. 143) we gather that Professor Ryle is prepared to vindicate, though not without some misgivings, Ezra's policy on the burning question of his day, the question of "mixed marriages"; he admits that Ezra "strained the letter of the law," but holds that he was justified by "the critical position of the Jewish community," and the fact that "the permanence of Judaism depended on the religious separateness of the Jews." He does not believe that Ezra left Jerusalem and returned to Babylon after the failure of his mission (p. 288), or that the dedication of the walls was delayed until twelve years after their completion (p. 298); on both of which points he differs from Canon Rawlinson, and is unquestionably in the right. Very suggestive is his comment (p. 241) on the fact that the high priest's name is not mentioned in connection with the Reading of the Law: "If, as some critics have supposed, Ezra himself had composed the Priestly Laws, and was now promulgating them for the first time, the high priest, whose position owed so much of its dignity in later days to those laws, would surely have been mentioned as countenancing Ezra's action. If, however, as seems more probable, Ezra was for the first time publishing to the people laws which had hitherto been kept in the priests' hands, we have a possible explanation for the absence of the high priest and his party, who would regard his action as subversive of their authority." Even the critics referred to will admit that a point is scored against them here very neatly. As examples of the skilful and thorough treatment which minor points of difficulty, due to corruption or dubiety of the text, receive in this commentary, we may refer to the Notes on Ezra x. 44; Neh. ii. 1, iii. 12 (where, however, we question the statement that "the most simple and literal explanation is probably the best"), iv. 23, vi. 10, viii. 7, 8, xiii. 19, 22. Professor Ryle is to be congratulated on a lightness of touch and a happy directness of phrase which give his work a character of its own; such expressions, for example, as "it was not for him (Nehemiah) to show the white feather," and "payment was 'hung up' for a whole year," are unusual in Biblical commentaries, but by no means unwelcome. The author remarks very justly, in his Introduction, that "the importance of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah among the Scriptures of the Old Testament Canon has often been overlooked. Their pages, indeed, reveal no mighty miracle, no inspiring prophecy, no vision, no heroic feat of arms. Their narrative contains many uninteresting details, and chronicles many disappointments. And yet few books offer such a variety of interest or embrace material of such deep significance." This commentary will be found by all who use it to add largely to the interest, and to bring out clearly the significance, of the two books with which it deals.

P. HAY-HUNTER.

THE THEOLOGICAL STUDENT. A HANDBOOK OF ELEMENTARY THEOLOGY.

By J. ROBINSON GREGORY. C. H. Kelly, London.

WE have read this little book with great satisfaction, and the reading of it has given rise to many reflections. One thought is, how much agreement there is in all sections of the Church of Christ with regard to the great fundamental verities of the faith. Much of what is said by Mr. Gregory might be said by all the sections of the Church. No doubt there are sections which would not command the assent of some Churches. The modern High Church party of the Church of England would seriously object to the Notes on the Apostolical Succession, and on the Historical Episcopate; and other sections might also object to some particular statement. But on the whole, and looking to the exposition of the main doctrines, we have from the pen of Mr. Gregory a treatise for which we may be thankful. The style is clear and incisive;



statements of doctrine are clear and unambiguous; arguments are clearly and tersely put; and Mr. Gregory's knowledge and learning are always adequate. The "Preliminary Assumptions" set forth the main apologetic arguments with great brevity and with marvellous lucidity and power. As an example of his power of terse statement, we refer to his description of anti-Theistic theories, in which he depicts with great felicity Atheism, Deism, Polytheism, Pantheism, Positivism, Materialism, and Agnosticism. All through the little book we find similar examples of brief and luminous statement. On the whole, they are such as will likely command assent. Mr. Gregory's attitude is that of a well-informed, thoughtful, and somewhat conservative theologian. It may be illustrated by the following on the Higher Criticism:—

"This name is given to certain Methods of investigating the origin and composition of the various books of the Bible. It is altogether outside the scope of this handbook. Because it has been pursued chiefly, though far from wholly, by rationalists and semi-rationalists, many people imagine that necessarily it destroys faith in the Bible as revelation from God. Critical methods can be employed for defence as well as for attack. Sober criticism may manifest that traditional views as to the mode in which the Bible grew need some modification. We welcome fresh light from any quarter; but additional knowledge as to Divine methods in no way lessens Divine operation. At present the controversy is too fierce for its issues to be tabulated, scarcely forecast. So far as the Bible is the source of Theology, we may dismiss 'the Higher Criticism' from our thoughts."

JAMES IVERACH, D.D.

**DID MOSES WRITE THE PENTATEUCH AFTER ALL?** By F. E. SPENCER, M.A., formerly of Queen's College, Oxford, and Vicar of All Saints, Haggerston, in the Diocese of London. London: Elliot Stock, 1892.

THIS is a most enjoyable book; the author possesses a fine vein of sarcasm, which he uses with great effect upon those whom he justly calls the orthodox school of critics, specially represented by Dr. Driver. The book will be most pleasant and satisfactory reading to those who agree with the author and are quite determined never to change their views; even if they do not read the book, the sufficiently authoritative name on the title-page and the profusion of Hebrew words in Hebrew type will reassure them, as showing that another competent scholar is added to the faithful few, who still advocate the almost exploded theory of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. To inquirers with an open mind the book may be still more profitable, though in a direction not contemplated by the author. Inquirers often hear somewhat large and confident statements as to the conclusive proofs of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, which will be adduced when any conservative critic has leisure to undertake the task. It is as well that these proofs should sometimes be set forth; that the ragged regiment should now and then be marched through Coventry, that men may see there is only an argument and a half in the whole company, and the half argument is two fallacies tacked together. But one could wish that the author's learning and ability, and the leisure time snatched from the work of a poor London parish, had been embarked in a more hopeful enterprise. There is much that is interesting and suggestive in the book, but the most striking points are irrelevant to the main issue. For instance, some pages are devoted to arguing that the title of a MS. is very strong evidence as to the authorship of its contents. It dawns upon the author afterwards that there is no title of the Pentateuch ascribing it to Moses, but nevertheless he lets his argument stand. Mr. Spencer's book, while professing to deal with the Pentateuch question as a whole, does not contain any clear or full statement of the case against the Mosaic authorship. It is chiefly a critique of the Pentateuch section in Dr. Driver's Introduction, and not therefore a satisfactory treatment of the general question. Dr. Driver's book, to which European scholarship,

and English students in particular, are so deeply indebted, does not profess to give the arguments by which the present critical views on the Pentateuch have been arrived at. It is a statement of results, with brief indications of leading arguments. This misapprehension has seriously interfered with the clearness and point of Mr. Spencer's apology. Mr. Spencer habitually and exclusively thinks along the lines of the theory he advocates, and has not considered the modern position with sufficient sympathy, patience, or tolerance to enable him in any way to understand its strength. As for Dr. Driver, whom he has selected as the main object of his attack, he often misunderstands, and consequently misrepresents him; he is utterly misled by the candid way in which Dr. Driver sets forth objections to the modern theory, and by the guarded and exact statements of Dr. Driver's own views; and actually supposes him to be in doubt as to the composite character of JE., putting into Dr. Driver's own mouth words that are given as those of an imaginary objector.

With great ingenuity, Mr. Spencer puts Dr. Driver's list of words characteristic of the Priestly Code to a use of his own. One argument for the antiquity of the Pentateuch is its use of antiquated words, the words in question are antiquated because they only occur in the Pentateuch. If the comparative age of books is to be determined by the proportion of ἀπὸ λεγόμενα, criticism will be simplified, but the results will hardly satisfy even Mr. Spencer. Some "antiquated words" also occur in Chronicles. Ancient thorough-going advocates of a solid Mosaic Pentateuch narrated how God dictated to Moses the account of his death, and he wrote it down with tears. The application of this principle to the history of Chronicles, combined with a careful study of vocabulary, might enable us to establish the Mosaic authorship of Chronicles.

Another inevitable result of the author's exclusively one-sided point of view is, that he frequently assumes the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in order to prove that very position. It will be seen that the book will scarcely serve as a popular handbook of Mosaic apologetics, nor does it make any appreciable addition to the strength of the position defended by Bissell, Cave, Green, and Ives Curtiss; but it may be read with interest as a collection of specimens of lively guerilla raids in connection with the critical campaign. Its greatest significance is its concessions in fact, after the confident and uncompromising tone of the book, the main conclusion comes as an unqualified surprise. It is on very much the same lines as Dr. Cave's Journal theory, with the best points omitted, but we will give it in the author's own words. "The Pentateuch, as we now possess it, with some relatively insignificant exceptions, was drawn up in all its parts under the immediate superintendence and inspiring guidance of Moses by the aid of unknown collaborators. The poems and discourses ascribed to him are judged to be immediately his, both from evidences of style and from a reasonable trust in the veracity of tradition in so great a case. And these, with the rest of Deuteronomy, were collected and set forth as they now stand by Joshua, and those who helped him. In fine, Moses, to use a modern expression, is responsible for the Pentateuch as a whole, but not responsible unaided. The Pentateuch must also have passed through several editions, of which one can scarcely with probability be refused to the age of Solomon, and of which the last can, with some degree of confidence, be attributed to Ezra and the men of his day." If such a theory satisfies the devoted adherents of traditional criticism, they are thankful for very small mercies. This result shows how strong an impression the anti-Mosaic argument has made, by sheer force, upon a determined and unsympathetic but candid opponent.

W. H. BENNETT, M.A.

## LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

**SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.** By JOHN MILEY, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J. Vol. I. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1892, 8vo, pp. xvi., 533, \$3.

The high quality of the "Biblical and Theological Library," now publishing by the Methodist Publication House, does honor to the great denomination which it represents. Dr. Miley's "Systematic Theology" is the latest issue in the series, and it is highly but not unduly praised when it is recognized as worthy to stand in company with Dr. Bennett's "Christian Archaeology" and Dr. Terry's "Biblical Hermeneutics." It is clearly, directly, and strongly written; it is characterized by candor, restraint, and modesty; it is orderly in arrangement and lucid in discussion. It is altogether a good book, which the Arminian should find rarely satisfying, and with which the Calvinist should count it a privilege to join issue.

It is somewhat embarrassing to undertake an estimate of a half-finished book. When a treatise is occupied, as this is, with a well-known system of thought, the end is no doubt seen from the beginning; but something depends on individuality in the modes of statement and defence. In the present instance the embarrassment is increased by the fact that a number of detailed discussions, belonging to matters treated in this volume, have been postponed to an appendix, to be printed at the end of the second volume. We can scarcely fail, however, to catch from Dr. Miley's clear pages the elements of the doctrines which he would commend.

An introduction of some fifty pages is occupied with the nature, sources, scope, and method of systematic theology. We miss here a satisfactory discrimination of the theological disciplines; and this has affected somewhat the contents of the volume. The great subject of "Theism," which Dr. Miley makes the first division of systematic theology, we should include in the preliminary discipline of apologetics. On the other hand, this introduction contains very illuminating discussions of such topics as these: the nature of scientific treatment; the scientific basis of Christianity; the right of systematization and the value of dogma; and the method of systematizing—under which occurs a very sensible criticism of the so-called "Christocentric" method. Dr. Miley despairs of attaining a single "unifying principle" in theology, and holds that systematizing must proceed "in a synthetic mode." He

therefore follows the customary order of topics.

The sources of theology are distributed broadly into nature and revelation; and these sources are fruitfully discriminated on the basis of "modes of knowledge" (p. 9). Knowledge acquired "in the use of human faculties" is natural; that immediately communicated by Divine agency is revealed. In the one case "the mode of acquisition is purely human;" "the discovery of truth is mediated by the use of our own faculties." In the other, "it is immediately given by the supernatural agency of God." "It is important," he adds justly, "thus sharply to discriminate these two modes of truth." For, if we lay the stress on source or agency alone, without taking into account also mode of knowledge, we may find ourselves embarrassed before the current pantheizing conception, which, by postulating immanent deity in all human thought, confounds the categories of reason and revelation, and thus does away with the category of revelation altogether, as readers of Dr. Whiton's recent little book, called "Gloria Patri," have occasion to observe anew. We regret to note Dr. Miley, at a later point (p. 11), apparently deserting this ground. He there seems to posit a reception by heathen men of a Divine revelation, which comes to them through their human faculties, and is not verified to the recipient as from God. Here he seems to step beyond the wall of his own definition, with the effect of throwing himself into the hands of the mystic rationalists. We must hasten to add, however, that when he comes to treat formally of mysticism (p. 16), he rejects the mystical path for attaining religious truth altogether, and deals very stringently with the modern doctrine of the Christian consciousness. We must confess that we know not how the views expressed at p. 11, as to a not uncommon revelation to heathen seekers, can be accorded with the criticism here; unless we are to suppose that God is nearer to heathen than to Christians, and deals more intimately with them than with Christians. We may take note, by the way, of the skill and success with which Dr. Miley treats the whole matter of the relation of reason and feeling.

The topics which fall under the head of theology proper are treated with logical power and self-restraint. The term "attribute" seems unduly limited in sense; but the distinction drawn between the "personal attributes" and all others is sound and fruitful. The Divine intellect is discussed under the caption of omniscience; and the perplexities which emerge from it for Arminian thought are not disguised (p. 189 *sq.*). Dr. Miley refuses, however, to be led by these perplexities

into a denial of the Divine foreknowledge of free actions, which he defends unanswerably against the arguments of Dr. McCabe (p. 181). We cannot think, however, that he has followed out his own arguments to their legitimate conclusions. They not only involve the admission of the certainty (as distinguished from the necessity) of free actions (p. 183), which is all any Calvinist believes; but they distinctly imply the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. For example, he acutely reduces the difficulties which are asserted to stand in the way of God's foreknowledge of the free acts of men to absurdity, by pointing out that the same difficulties would press equally against God's foreknowledge of His own free acts. This is unanswerable. But it will require an immeasurably more acute logic still to distinguish God's foreknowledge of His future choices, from a fore-intention to make those choices; and this is just the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. And as it will be impossible to disentangle the future choices of God from those of His creatures, with which they are interwoven in the actual web of life, it will be exceedingly difficult to deny to these creature choices also a place in the comprehensive plan already foreknown in all its parts in eternity, and therefore predestinated or predestinated. Again, the objection that it would be inconsistent with the Divine goodness to create souls whose rejection of salvation is certainly foreknown, is justly set aside with the remark that nescience will not obviate the objection; inasmuch as it presses almost equally against the creation of souls with the known possibility of their loss, and quite equally against the continuance of the race after the fact of such numerous losses has emerged in experience. But surely the bottom of the matter is not yet reached; for if God creates souls which He certainly foreknows will be lost, He must create them with the intention, in this sense, of their being lost; and this is the whole content of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination in this case—of that *decretum horribile* to which men seem so unceasingly to object, but which is as surely a truth of reason as it is of Scripture.

The real difficulty here Dr. Miley finds in the very existence of moral evil under the government of God. He considers that a complete theodicy is unattainable to human knowledge (p. 429 *sq.*); but we cannot consent to stop at the point at which he elects to stay his efforts to discover one. In this matter, as elsewhere, he appears to go upon a principle which is naturally very attractive to minds of the analytical power of his—the principle of *divide et impera*. The danger is that in the analysis the essence of the question may slip out between the joints. This is

what happens here. Dr. Miley shows in turn that (1) the creation of moral beings is permissible; (2) that a probationary economy is permissible; and (3) that therefore the fall, which is necessarily contemplated as a possibility in a probationary economy, is permissible. Most excellent. But the question still remains for one who accepts, with the frankness of Dr. Miley, the doctrine of God's complete foreknowledge, how could it be permissible to create these moral beings and put them in this probationary economy, with the knowledge, not that they *might possibly* fall, but that they *certainly would* fall? The only tenable ground here is the Calvinistic ground that such action on God's part involves the Divine intention, in this sense, of the fall—*i.e.*, its predestination. And the only conceivable direction in which to look for a theodicy is in that of an end great and glorious enough to justify the incidental evil arising from this course. Dr. Miley rejects out of hand all such theodicies, on the ground that "the fall itself," in that case, "must have been completely within the disposition of Divine providence" (p. 439). But certainly we cannot exclude it from God's providence, as a single question will show. What required God to create just those free agents whom He foreknew would fall? Or shall we say that while He foreknew that some angels would stand and others fall, it was impossible for Him to create a *human* free agent whose standing He could foreknow? In that case we must say either that *human* free actions cannot be foreknown (which Dr. Miley denies), or else that all possible *human* free agents would certainly fall, which would make human sin a necessity of nature without developing any theodicy for God's creation of such a nature.

In these remarks on the origin of evil we have, of course, passed out of the domain of theology proper into that of anthropology, leaving much behind of which we should like to speak. It is in the anthropology of the volume, of course, that the Calvinistic reader will find most which will seem to him open to question; and this the more that Dr. Miley occupies in this sphere the extremest Arminian ground. We find much, here too, in the way of care in statement and candor in treatment to admire; and we willingly bear witness to the fairness with which the Augustinian positions are stated. Dr. Miley divides the great question of original sin into three: whether there is such a thing as native depravity; whether it is penal; whether it is guilty. Only the first does he answer affirmatively. He teaches that all men are naturally depraved, and out of that depravity will certainly commit sin; but that this depravity does not come to them in any true sense by way of penalty,



but only through the law of nature that "like begets like;" and that, because they are born with it and do not produce it, they cannot be held responsible for it, and it therefore is (as our New England brethren used to call it) "uncondemnable vitiosity." Of course we shall not commit the folly of attempting to refute this, as it seems to us, very refutable position, in the course of this brief notice. Let us only remark in passing that it passes the comprehension of our Calvinistically warped mind to understand how so close a thinker can, on the one hand, hang the whole weight of depravity on a "law of nature," or, on the other, deny the condemnability of a state of depravity which inevitably produces sin in every action into which it issues. What is a "law of nature"? and who made it a "law of nature"? and on what ground of right? To say that all that was threatened to Adam for sin—physical death and its precedent weaknesses and pains and spiritual death or depravity, with its inevitable issue into actual sinning—has been brought upon mankind simply on the basis of a "law of nature," so that the whole race is brought through the mediation of depravity into actual sin and guilt without possibility of escape, on the sole basis of a "law of nature"—is just no explanation at all: it is the deification of a phrase. And to say that a depravity which originally arose in personal action, and which is apparently the same in us as in Adam, and which is the inevitable spring of sin and the actual source of all sinning, is non-condemnable because it is only a "subjective quality"—is to antagonize the most intimate and ineradicable convictions of the human mind. If God looks upon Adam before the fall, and finds him with a "subjective quality" which is "excellent" and "pleasing to the Divine mind," how should He not be pleased and show His pleasure? And if God looks upon us, after the fall, and finds us with a "subjective quality" which is not excellent, but depraved and displeasing to His holiness, how should He not be displeased and show His displeasure? Such teaching confounds all our ideas of God as a moral agent.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.  
*Princeton Theological Seminary.*

ELEMENTS OF THEOLOGY, NATURAL AND REVEALED. By JAMES H. FAIRCHILD, Professor of Theology in Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.: Edward J. Goodrich, 1892, 8vo, pp. xv., 358.

The publication of this system of divinity by the Nestor of Oberlin, who has ruled for over a generation in its theological thought, is modestly ascribed, in the Preface, to the importunity of pupils.

It is of value to many others also in indicating the doctrinal position of Oberlin to-day, and its close adherence to the teachings of Finney and the New Haven theology. This relation to Finney is to be found more in the general positions of the system than in the specific teaching on the doctrine of Perfectionism. Indeed, here the author dissents from Finney's doctrine, holding that Finney did not logically carry out the "doctrine of simplicity" in considering Perfection a secondary stage after Conversion. Dr. Fairchild deprecates the scorch after "Sanctification as a special experience," and indicates that there may be "false and fanatical views in this direction."

Perhaps the fullest and most catholic discussion is on the Person of Christ. The inductive method is used in the collation of passages of Scripture which throw light on the different sides of the character of Christ. The glow of personal faith and loyalty shines through the chapter. With the dogmatic aspects the author is largely indifferent. The doctrine of the Eternal Sonship is not accepted, and the term "person" in the Trinity is considered an unfortunate expression. The statement that Kenosis is essentially Monophysitism is hardly exact: Kenosis is the emptying of the Divine nature; Monophysitism was the absorption of the human nature in the Divine.

The genealogy of the main doctrines may perhaps be defined as follows: Finneyism, in the confounding of Regeneration, Conversion, and Repentance; Taylorism, in the general Governmental view and in adherence to the doctrines of Power to the Contrary, Sin consists in Sinning, and Ability limits Obligation; Emmonsism, in making Justification equal Pardon; Bishop Butler's Analogy, in the discussion of Immortality; the Platform of the Remonstrants, in denying Irresistible Grace; Semi-pelagianism, in making Depravity a sickness, not a sin; and Pelagianism, in making all morality in the free acts of the individual.

The discussion of the Doctrine of God is a brief presentation, on the grounds of Natural Theology alone, of the New Haven Benevolence view of the Divine character. The *a priori* arguments are dismissed as unsatisfactory, the cosmological argument is well stated, and a chapter is given to Pantheistic views. Possibly Hegel would object to the label "defender of Schelling." In his conception of the absolute and method of development he opposed and attacked Schelling.

Of the moral attributes of God, Benevolence "expresses the entirety of His moral character." Holiness, Justice, Mercy are but different aspects of Benevolence. The Decrees of God do not touch man's will.

"Human character, free action, and voluntary choices are not decreed" (p. 99), and yet "the salvation of some men and rejection of others already lies in His [God's] purpose, foreseen and predetermined" (p. 291). Logically following this view of the Divine character come the definitions of Virtue and views of the Atonement. Virtue is love of well being; Sin is "the refusal to be benevolent." "Truth itself has no value; its value is in its relation to well being" (p. 120). Atonement, since Justice is refused in Benevolence, becomes a governmental expedient; Satisfaction and formal substitution are denied.

In the introductory chapter it is asserted that "every theology has its philosophy, either true or false." Our author is sounder here than Ritschl and the later Germans. But it is in this philosophy, "either true or false," underlying "The Elements of Theology," developed most fully in the doctrines of the Will, Sin, and Conversion, that most opposition will no doubt be found to the author's positions.

This philosophy is that the Will, the faculty of choice, no matter what the character is, is absolutely and unqualifiedly free. "We know that we are free, and that is the end of the argument." "Motives do not move the will" (p. 40). "The will determines which motive shall be strongest" (p. 44). "The view that the will is determined by the inclination or disposition or character obliterates freedom" (p. 44). "Linking the will to motive, inclination, character," "makes the man a machine, and annihilates responsibility" (p. 45). Without the use of the words "Power to the Contrary" we have the full-fledged view. There is no recognition of difference between certainty and necessity, no limitation placed on absolute ability to choose. A certain "tendency to self-indulgence," inherited, does not, apparently, reach to the Will. This philosophy, "true or false," is the constructive principle of the system. It is the Declaration of Independence against Divine Sovereignty; but it is fully as one-sided, and it is the lesser side at that. Orthodox opponents might note sardonically that this Pelagian view of absolute self-determination is discussed in a chapter prior to the admission of Holy Scripture as a factor in the arguments.

In turning to the doctrines of Sin, Depravity, and Ability, we seem again to

"Ope the purple testament of bleeding war,"

and renew once more the Connecticut controversies of Taylor against Tyler. Dr. Fairchild certainly accepts the New England "Improvements in Theology." The view of Sin is comprehensible, if not comprehensive. Sin is "refusal to be benevo-

lent" (p. 127); it "pertains only to voluntary actions" (p. 128), and lies in the will, as distinguished from the motive or nature. The view that Sin is a defect of constitution or nature is asserted to be "superficial and shallow" (p. 168). Sin and its opposite, Holiness, is a voluntary attitude, a state of the will: Sin is the attitude in refusing to be benevolent; Holiness is the opposite attitude in the "love of well being of sentient beings." Hence these two attitudes, by the "Doctrine of Simplicity," mutually exclude each other. Every human being, apparently, must have one or the other of these "attitudes," which resemble the condition of the inhabitants of Laputa, whose "heads were all reclined either to the right or to the left."

There is a limitation, however, of the external "Exercise scheme." Though sin is held to be in action only (p. 128), and not in a "set of the will" (p. 125), yet the will is held in its generic form to be "not in the outward sinful act, but in the inward sinful state" (p. 126); and "sinful character exists, even if there be no particular vice or sinful outward act." Expressions like "settled and habitual state of thought," and "drift of thought or feeling," and the "sense in which character lies outside the will," indicate a turning of reason against logic, from the "Exercise" theory to the "Taste" theory.

Mankind inherits "a propenseness to sin, or, rather, a predominance of impulsers and passions which induce sin" (p. 154). These are held to be temptations only. Two passages on pages 160 and 161 represent the Scylla and Charybdis of this semi-pelagianism. We trust the reader can steer between. On page 160 we read, "Nor is it clear that we inherit directly from Adam, by reason of the fall, a great accession of physical depravity—that is, aggravated tendencies or propension in the direction of sin." This is Scylla. Facing it on the next page is this: "In addition, we inherit from Adam and other sinful ancestors derangements of constitution, to an unknown extent, *aggravated tendencies to self-indulgence and sin.*" The only way to get past Charybdis is to consider that the "aggravated tendencies" to sin come either from Adam, *not by reason of the fall*, or come from Seth, Noah, and "other sinful ancestors."

The "Elements of Theology" goes back from Taylor to Emmons in maintaining that Justification is simply pardon. Merging, with Finney, Regeneration, Conversion, and Sanctification, Conversion is held to be "ceasing to sin." "The sinner renounces sin wholly." This is not such a difficult thing as might be supposed when we remember that sin is simply "refusal to be benevolent." Regeneration and Conversion are first asserted to be the same

thing, "the work of the sinner" (p. 233). Then Regeneration is stated to be a prior Divine persuasion (p. 235) and subsequent Divine sustenance (p. 240), "which, as distinguished from Conversion, is the work of God" (p. 242). The omissions in the Index remind us of the fact that both etymologically and practically the Index of a Manual is the forefinger of the hand.

HENRY GOODWIN SMITH.

*Freehold, N. J.*

HENRY BOYNTON SMITH. By LEWIS F. STEARNS, D.D., late Professor in Bangor Theological Seminary. (American Religious Leaders.) Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1892, 12mo, pp. 368, \$1.25.

One cannot read this book, with its note of sorrow over the untimely death of Professor Smith, without feeling that the pathos of the lament is deepened by the author's own premature death. There must be activities of a high and pressing nature into which such men are gathered out of a world needing them as sorely as ours.

In about one quarter of the volume the author sketches the life of Professor Smith before he entered upon his true life-work as a teacher. The color of his earlier experiences is strongly marked in his later modes of thinking, the experience of young manhood in his intellectual and spiritual struggles admirably fitting him, in the providence of God, for the mediating position which he occupied, both as theologian and ecclesiastical statesman, in the Church of his adoption.

Emerging from Unitarianism, the reaction from mere humanitarianism is strongly marked in the attitude of his mind toward the great evangelical doctrines. Salvation by amiableness had not satisfied his awakened conscience. A deep conviction of sin, of his own inability to change his heart or to quiet conscience, led him easily to rest in the scriptural presentation of an atoning Saviour, the fulness and freedom of whose redemption it was ever afterward his joy to magnify. Despite Professor Stearns' lament that Dr. Smith did not more fully Christologize his system, we incline to believe that at times Dr. Smith accords to Christ a position theologically which the Master did not assume for Himself. His earlier experience with doubts and difficulties, and the consequent ability to put himself sympathetically in the position of an honest objector, which Dr. Stearns so well brings out, leads him at times judiciously to stop short of statements to which a more complete and exhaustive logic might have led. So to state truth as to win, rather than to force an unwilling and resisting conclusion, seems to have been the law of Dr. Smith's teach-

ing. His ministerial experience also tended to give a practical tone to his work. Professor Smith would surely have sympathized with Dr. Stearns' view (p. 79) of the necessity of a previous ministerial training as an antidote to the barren rationalism into which the merely speculative scholar is so apt to fall when he assumes the teacher's chair.

The author dwells with sympathy and interest on Dr. Smith's preparatory work in philosophy and history. These are, perhaps, the most interesting and satisfactory chapters in the book. The historic sense is needed to pin the philosopher down to the facts in the case, which are all there and all true, whether his philosophy can adjust them in harmonious relation or not. The value of history to Dr. Smith was that it revealed the purpose of God and the method by which He brings His purpose to pass, the superior value of church history in this respect being that we get a little closer to the hand that holds the instrument. This is essentially a Calvinistic view, and it is essentially a hopeful view, if one still further holds that "the whole history of the Church might be summed up with saying that it consists in pouring into the human race the treasures of this volume [the Bible], there to germinate until the kingdom revealed in word and promise shall be fully manifested in its reality and power" (p. 162). Hopefulness—a hopefulness springing from simple faith in the sovereignty of a God of infinite wisdom, holiness, and love, with power adequate to the expression of His character in His will—was a marked feature in all the work of Professor Smith, as is abundantly illustrated in the pages of this volume.

Most readers will turn probably with most interest to the chapter on "The Professor of Theology;" and we are inclined to think that Dr. Smith's old students, most in sympathy with the teachings of their venerated instructor, will here experience some consciousness of disappointment. It is naturally the longest chapter in the book; it bears the mark of painstaking; it is by no means void of sympathy; and yet it has the aspect of criticism rather than of review in not a few points where the reader will most wish for something more than criticism. To Dr. Smith's eminent fitness for teaching theology, in his natural acuteness of mind, the severe discipline of independent study, wide reading, and previous training in philosophy and history—two indispensable factors in theology—Professor Stearns heartily testifies, as he does to the loving spirit without which it is impossible to understand or unfold the things of Him whose name is Love. There is, however, a clear trace of the feeling that Dr. Smith

did not fulfil the promise of his purpose in assuming the chair. Part of this, no doubt, on the very face of it, is a disappointment which all must feel; for Dr. Smith, as Professor Stearns says, "left behind him no satisfactory exposition of his system." The fragmentary nature of not a little of his work can readily be appreciated by students who remember how occasionally he would fumble about for the loose slip which he could not find, on which was his latest thought, and then break out into what was usually the best work of the hour, extemporaneous explanation of the point in question. There is at times an uncertainty about some of his statements (e.g., imputation), which leaves us in doubt whether his latest notes could not be found by the editor, or whether the professor was not quite prepared to defend the view most congenial to his system.

Fragmentary, however, as is much of what is left of Dr. Smith's work in the class-room, he has made substantial contributions to his favorite science, especially along apologetic lines, and points in which theology comes into contact with ethics and metaphysics. A part of the difficulty, or rather lack of consistency in Dr. Smith's theological work, comes from the announced aim of what Professor Stearns seems to approve, that the theology suited to our times "should strive to be a mediating system between the conflicting parties of the times" (p. 194). No theology can well be consistent that takes its eye off from God and truth to view the squabbles of contending factions. The theologian has simply to take the facts, wherever God has revealed them, and apply to these, with no omissions, a true philosophy. Dr. Stearns's chief difficulty, however, is in Dr. Smith's failure to "Christologize" all his theology. If Dr. Stearns has left behind him a system, it will be interesting to see how he himself succeeds in "Christologizing" the Decrees, and in putting him that was sent back of Him who sent him, and whose will it was his meat to do. The professor criticises somewhat sharply Dr. Smith's view of the Will, and makes merry over his inability to account for the first sin of holy Adam. If he had himself a theory satisfactorily accounting for it, without eviscerating the facts of their contents, it will be a thousand pities if he has carried his theory out of our world with him.

With Dr. Smith's treatment of "Incarnation in Order to Redemption" our author is in fuller sympathy, until he comes to the application of this redemption, the Calvinism of the Union professor being apparently too stiff for his New England latitude.

The book pays hearty and well-merited tribute to Dr. Smith's editorial labors—he

seems to us to have been at his best as a reviewer—and to his efforts on behalf of the cause of liberty in the State, while he gives to Professor Smith the highest place among the men of his time for his successful efforts to bring together on the basis of the Standards, historically interpreted, the Old and New School Presbyterian churches. He generously refrains from any criticisms on the present relation of the various parties in the Presbyterian Church to the agreement to which Dr. Smith stood sponsor. The work throughout is characterized by a most Christian and catholic spirit. No man of our time lives more lovingly in the hearts of the Presbyterian Church than Professor Henry B. Smith. Dr. Stearns is beyond the reach of the thanks of the many who have enjoyed his tribute to the older theologian, but the reader who enjoys this book, as every intelligent reader must, may at least indulge the melancholy satisfaction of profound regret at the untimely death of Professor Stearns.

TIMOTHY G. DARLING.

*Auburn Theological Seminary.*

#### BRIEF REVIEWS AND NOTICES,

BY THE EDITOR.

*Bible Studies* is the title of a volume of discourses by Henry Ward Beecher, now first published, though originally delivered nearly fifteen years ago. They are designated as "Readings in the Early Books of the Old Testament, with Familiar Comment, given in 1878-79." They are edited by John R. Howard, from stenographic notes. (New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert, 1893, 8vo, pp. 438, \$1.50.) The statement that these sermons will be eagerly welcomed by a large circle of readers is self-evident. And as one reads one is impressed with the thought that the preacher was a man in advance of his time. Some of the questions here treated are even now in hot dispute in some parts of the land. Mr. Beecher did not approach them from the side of the specialist nor of the profound scholar, but from the practical side of the preacher of the truth. Consequently some of these discourses have an added value. They are examples of the fact that there is no such deadening effects to be feared from the theories and discoveries of scholars as is sometimes alleged. To one who has had experience of the truth, the Bible is true and powerful irrespective of critical questions of authorship. The Bible evidences itself to be the Word of God through the witness of the Spirit which informs it, not by the connection therewith of the name of Moses or any other. To Mr. Beecher the Bible was God's truth, and it was powerful for the



objects for which it was given. Any other foundation is weak and shifting, with no promise of permanence. The volume contains twenty-three discourses. Some of the titles are as follows: "The Inspiration of the Bible," "How to Read the Bible," "The Book of Beginnings," "Emancipation," "The Sabbath," "Humanity," "The Household," "Social Observances." The reader will regret that the series ends with "Naomi and Ruth," and that Mr. Beecher was unable to carry out his plan of giving a continuation of the series covering the later books. Meantime our thanks are due to the stenographer and editor, who have preserved and given us this feast of good things.

It is a matter of some surprise to receive a volume on the "Higher Criticism" dated from Australia, but, after all, the wonder need not last long. It is one of the latest additions to Old Testament literature, and also one of considerable importance and note. The author is W. E. Addis, M.A., of Balliol College, Oxford, who writes from Melbourne. He has entitled his work *The Documents of the Hexateuch*, translated and arranged in chronological order, with introduction and notes. In the present volume is contained Part I., "The Oldest Book of Hebrew History." (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1893, 8vo, pp. xciv., 236, \$3.) It has been his purpose to place in the hands of lay readers of ordinary intelligence a volume which shall set forth the results at which scholars have arrived. He is one who is qualified for his task by wide reading and comprehensive knowledge; and having at his command a power of expression rather above the average, he has succeeded in making a clear and excellent book, giving the views of hexateuchal analysis entertained by the school of Graf, to which he belongs. The task is not a new one in its conception, but it is novel in its extent. Previous writers have restricted their labors to a narrower field, being content with the analysis of Genesis. It is, therefore, a gain to have the work continued through the succeeding books. Whether one agrees with the results or not, one may thank the author for doing what he has, and for making the results of critical scholarship thus accessible. The writer gives a brief account of the course of critical investigation, and then summarizes the arguments upon which reliance is placed for the critical division. The fact that the same lines of cleavage are found in Joshua as in the earlier books is of fundamental importance, since it goes far toward determining the date of composition, and justifies the addition which turns the Pentateuch into the Hexateuch. A point of very considerable moment upon which the author touches, but upon which he does not enlarge, is the method of his-

torical writing in vogue among the Hebrews. Much of the difficulty which is found to-day with the critical theories arises from an importation of modern notions of authorship and of literary morality into ages where these ideas did not exist and where they found no recognition. We fail to place ourselves *en rapport* with the literary feelings and practices of the time, and hence fail to appreciate the facts. Besides, dogmatic considerations are imported likewise into the discussion, and scholars are accused of an impious rationalism which in many cases is not justified by the facts. To such persons the present volume will not be welcome, but the question really at issue is simply: What is the truth? For the determination of this question investigation is needed, and it must be free and unrestricted.

*New Commentary on Acts of Apostles.* By J. W. McGarvey, Professor of Sacred History in the College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky., Vol. 2. (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1892, 12mo, pp. 296, \$1.50.) The former volume of this work was noticed last September. The author is well qualified for his task by extensive travel in the Holy Land and the East, and he has produced a book which will be found useful to Sunday-school teachers and Bible classes. It is well printed on good paper and well bound.

*Men and Morals.* By the Rev. James Stalker, D.D. (New York and Chicago: Revell, 1892, 12mo, pp. 178, \$1.) When Dr. Stalker was in America a couple of years ago delivering the "Yale Lectures" on preaching, he was called upon to speak before many other audiences. Some of these addresses have already been printed and have found acceptance. He has now allowed the publication of others, eight in all, and the volume thus produced is a valuable contribution to the discussion of a number of themes connected with faith and conduct. "Conscience," "Christ and the Wants of Humanity," "The Religion for To-day," "The Evidences of Religion," "Temptation" are the titles of some of the addresses. They are remarkably clear and direct, needing no further interpreter than the seeing eye and the understanding heart.

*The Good Wine at the Feast's End* is the title of a delightful sermon by the late Rt. Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D., Bishop of the Diocese of Massachusetts (New York: Dutton, 1893, 16mo, pp. 32, 25 cents), upon the text John II. 10, in which the important and consoling lesson is set forth that life is increasingly good under the Christian conception of it, and that herein is a motive which appeals to the young, and is a source of encouragement and comfort to those of advancing years.

## INDEX OF PERIODICALS, MARCH, 1893.

Abbreviations of Magazine Titles used in the Index of Periodicals.

- Af. M. E. R. African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)
- A. R. Andover Review. (Bi monthly.)
- B. S. Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)
- B. W. The Biblical World.
- B. Q. R. Baptist Quarterly Review.
- Ch. Q. R. Church Quarterly Review.
- C. M. Q. Canadian Methodist Quarterly.
- C. R. Charities Review.
- C. T. Christian Thought.
- Ex. Expositor.
- Ex T. Expository Times.
- G. W. Good Words.
- H. R. Homiletic Review.
- K. M. Katholische Missionen.
- L. Q. Lutheran Quarterly.
- M. R. Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)
- M. H. Missionary Herald.
- Miss. R. Missionary Review.
- N. C. Q. New Christian Quarterly.
- N. H. M. Newbury House Magazine.
- N. W. The New World.
- O. D. Our Day.
- P. E. R. Protestant Episcopal Review.
- P. M. Preachers' Magazine.
- P. Q. Presbyterian Quarterly.
- P. R. R. Presbyterian and Reformed Review. (Quarterly.)
- R. Ch. Review of the Churches.
- R. Q. R. Reformed Quarterly Review.
- R. R. R. Religious Review of Reviews.
- S. A. H. Sunday at Home.
- S. M. Sunday Magazine.
- T. Tr. The Treasury.
- Y. R. The Yale Review.
- Aramaic Gospel, The, J. T. Marshall, ExT.
- Atheism, Present-Day Preaching, Edward White, PM.
- Bamberg, Sophia Beale, GW.
- Boarding-Out System, Some Developments of, Homer Folks, CR.
- Briggs Heresy Trial, C. R. Gillert, NW.
- Child Problem, The Legal Aspect of, Francis Wayland, CR.
- Christianity among Cannibals, John C. Paton, OD.
- Christ's Verity, S. H. Kellogg, PM.
- Christ's Authority as a Lawgiver, The Nature of, G. F. Genung, AR.
- Christ, The Spirit of, M. C. Peters, TTr.
- Coemopolitan Religion, C. A. Bartol, NW.
- Criticism of the Bible, Sidney A. Alexander, GW.
- Dependent Children, The Minnesota System of Caring for, H. W. Lewis, CR.
- Dependent and Delinquent Children under the System of the Roman Catholic Church, The Care of, A. G. Wagner, CR.
- Divorce Reform, Progress of National, S. W. Dike, OD.
- Egyptian Ka and Hebrew Kal, J. D. Steele, TTr.
- Elijah, N. L. Walker, ExT.
- Enigma, The Great, G. Holden, NHM.
- Excellent Way, The More, H. Montagu Butler, SM.
- Folk-Song of Israel, Karl Budde, NW.
- Fourth Gospel in the New Testament, The Place of, Orello Cone, NW.
- France, The Troubling of the Pool in, C. A. L. Richards, PER.
- Galilee, George Adam Smith, Ex.
- General Convention of 1892 The Chicago-Lambeth Declaration in, Hall Harrison, PER.
- Ghosts and Their Photographs, H. R. Hawels, OD.
- Gibeon in the Light of Later Scripture, The Miracle at, R. Balgarnie, HR.
- Gospels, Origin and Relation of the Four, J. J. Halcombe, ExT.
- Gospel of Matthew, The Fundamental Thought and Purpose of, Robert Kübel, BW.
- Gospel, The Fourth, Alfred W. Anthony, BW.
- Higher Criticism and its Application to the Bible, Edward Lewis Curtis, AR.
- Imagination, The Christian Use of, Hugh Price Hughes, PM.
- Incarnation, The Holy, H. W. Jewitt, NHM.
- Indianer-Territorium, Die Missionen der Bemediktiner in, KM.
- Inspiration, The Personal Factor in Biblical, Marvin R. Vincent, NW.
- Institution for Children, The Legitimate Use of, Mary E. R. Cobb, CR.
- Israel in Egypt, C. H. Toy, NW.
- Jubilee Remembrances, Newman Hall, SM.
- Judas Iscariot, Bishop of Ripon, GW.
- Kingdom of God, The, E. Haupt, ExT.
- Lord's Threefold Question, The, James Stalker, PM.
- Milton, Local Memories of, David Masson, GW.
- Ministry, The Importance of Personal Character in, A. P. Peabody, HR.
- Missionen, Nachrichten aus den, KM.
- Missions and Civilization, Charles A. Starbuck, AR.
- Morality on a Scientific Basis, James T. Bixby, AR.
- Moses, His Life and its Lessons, Mark Guy Pearse, PM.
- Mysticism at the New Gallery, Christian, Alfred Gurney, NHM.
- One Thing Needful, The, B. Waugh, SM.
- Orphan Asylum, The British, RRR.
- Palestine Possibilities of Excavation in, Charles F. Kent, BW.
- Paul's Conception of Christianity, A. B. Bruce, Ex.
- Phillips Brooks, William Lawrence, AR.
- Phillips Brooks, Archdeacon Farrar, RCh.
- Phillips Brooks, Joseph Cook, OD.
- Poverty, The Problem of, Arthur Finlayson, RRR.
- Prayer, Secret, Henry Wright, PM.
- Presbyterian Laymen, A Call for, George A. Strong, AR.
- Progress of the Churches, Archdeacon Farrar, J. Reid Howard, Dr. Mackennal, Dr. Clifford, P. W. Hunting, RCh.
- Reading and Readers, M. S. R. J., SM.
- Reading, The Art of, Canon Fleming, RRR.
- Religion, The Power of, Archbishop Thomson, RRR.
- Repentance, Three Motives to, James Denney, Ex.
- Reward, The Motive of, George C. Foley, PER.
- Sacraments, The, Principal Reynolds, RCh.
- Satire, English Religious, T. W. Hunt, HR.
- Schoolmistress, The Seventeenth-Century, Alice Pollard, NHM.
- Scripture Texts from Recent Discoveries, Light on, William Hayes Ward, HR.
- Sermon on the Mount, Moral Teaching of, F. H. Woods, ExT.
- Shamanism, J. Sheepshanks, NHM.
- Shepherd, Voice of the Lord, The, Dr. Weiss, TTr.
- Sinai, Eine Reise nach dem, KM.
- Sixth Hour, About the, W. M. Ramsay, Ex.
- Slavery in Africa, H. T. Cousins, SM.
- Socialism of the Prophets, The Alleged, A. W. Benn, NW.
- Spies, The Story of the, Philip A. Nordell, BW.
- Synoptic Problem, Some Points in, Y. H. Stanton, Ex.
- Tait, Archbishop, Kiloach Nelson, PER.
- Temperance Legislation, Miss Frances E. Willard, G. Armstrong Bennetts, RCh.
- Tennysonian, Evelyn Everett Green, SM.
- Tennyson, The Homiletic Value of, F. V. N. Painter, HR.
- Theological Instruction in Switzerland, P. W. Snyder, BW.
- Timely Services, Thoughts of, A. T. Pierson, TTr.
- Trümmern eines untergegangenen Volkes, Unter den, KM.

Ups and Downs of an Old Nunnery, Augustus Jessup, GW.  
Whately, Archdeacon, RRR.  
Whittier's Spiritual Career, John W. Chadwick, NW.  
Words of Christ, The Difficult, James Stalker, Ex.  
Young Men's Service, G. B. F. Halleck, TTr.

# CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

## THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

Boston, March-April, 1893.

The Higher Criticism and its Application to the Bible.  
The Nature of Christ's Authority as a Lawgiver.  
Missions and Civilization, III.  
Phillips Brooks  
A Call to Presbyterian Laymen.  
The Andover Band in Mayne.  
Morality on a Scientific Basis.

## THE BIBLICAL WORLD.

Chicago, March, 1893.

The Story of the Spies, a Study in Biblical Criticism.  
Theological Instruction in Switzerland, II.  
The Fourth Gospel, an Outline for the Study of its Higher Criticism.  
The Fundamental Thought and Purpose of the Gospel of Matthew.  
The American Institute of Sacred Literature.  
Historical Studies in the Scriptural Material of the International Lesson.  
Possibilities of Excavations in Palestine.

## THE CHARITIES REVIEW.

New York, March, 1893.

The Legal Aspect of the Child Problem.  
Some Developments of the Boarding-Out System.  
The Minnesota System of Caring for Dependent Children.  
The Legitimate Use of an Institution for Children.  
The Care of Dependent and Delinquent Children under the System of the Roman Catholic Church.  
The New Municipal Lodging-House in Washington.

## THE EXPOSITOR.

London, March, 1893.

Gallilee.  
Some Points in the Synoptic Problem.  
Paul's Conception of Christianity.  
About the Sixth Hour.  
The Difficult Words of Christ.  
Three Motives to Repentance.

## THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

London, March, 1893.

The Kingdom of God.  
The Ministry of Elijah.  
The Moral Teaching of the Sermon on the Mount.  
The Aramaic Gospel.  
The Origin and Relation of the Four Gospels.

## GOOD WORDS.

London, March, 1893.

Criticism and the Bible.  
Local Memories of Milton, III.  
Bamberg.  
Ups and Downs of an Old Nunnery, I.  
Judas Iscariot.

## THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

Toronto, New York, London, March, 1893.

The Importance of Personal Character in the Ministry.  
The Homiletic Value of Tennyson.  
The Miracle at Gibeon in the Light of Later Scripture.  
English Religious Satire.  
Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries.

## DIE KATHOLISCHEN MISSIONEN.

Freiburg im Breisgau, March, 1893.

Die Mission der Benediktiner im Indianer-Territorium.  
Unter den Trümmern eines untergegangenen Volkes.  
Eine Reise nach dem Sinai.  
Nachrichten aus den Missionen.

## THE NEWBERRY HOUSE MAGAZINE.

London, March, 1893.

The Holy Incarnation.  
Shamanism.  
The Great Enigma: A Review.  
Christian Mysticism at the New Gallery.  
The Seventeenth-Century Schoolmistress.

## THE NEW WORLD.

Boston, March, 1893.

The Place of the Fourth Gospel in the New Testament Literature.  
The Folk-Song of Israel in the Month of the Prophets.  
Cosmopolitan Religion.  
The Alleged Socialism of the Prophets.  
Whittier's Spiritual Career.  
The Personal Factor in Biblical Inspiration.  
Israel in Egypt.  
The Briggs Heresy Trial.

## OUR DAY.

Boston and Chicago, March, 1893.

Christianity among Cannibals.  
Progress of National Divorce Reform.  
Ghosts and Their Photographs.  
Boston Monday Lectures: Phillips Brooks.

## THE PREACHERS' MAGAZINE.

New York, March, 1893.

Present-Day Preaching: Atheism.  
Moses, the Last Plague.  
Christ's Verity.  
The Christian Use of the Imagination.  
Secret Prayer a Reality.

## THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL MAGAZINE.

Virginia, March, 1893.

The Troubling of the Pool in France.  
The Chicago-Lambeth Declaration in the General Convention of 1892.  
Archbishop Tait.  
The Motive of Reward.

## THE RELIGIOUS REVIEW OF REVIEWS.

London, February, 1893.

The Problem of Poverty, II.  
The Art of Reading, V.  
The Power of Religion.  
Philanthropic Institutions: The British Orphan Asylum.  
Archdeacon Whately.

## REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES.

London, February, 1893.

The Progress of the Churches,  
Phillips Brooks.  
Temperance Legislation: Past and Future.  
The Sacraments.

## THE SUNDAY MAGAZINE.

London, March, 1893.

The More Excellent Way.  
Jubilee Remembrances.  
Slavery in Africa.  
Reading and Readers.  
Tennysoniana.  
The One Thing Needful.

## THE TREASURY.

New York, March, 1893.

The Spirit of Christ: Sermon.  
The Shepherd Voice of the Lord: Expository Lecture.  
Thoughts of Timely Services.  
Young Men's Service: The Glory of Young Men.  
The Egyptian Ka and the Hebrew Kal: Critical Comment.

## THE APRIL MAGAZINES.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE for April contains: Frontispiece, "The Brooklyn Bridge on a Wintry Day," drawn by Child Hassam; "The City of Brooklyn," by Julian Ralph; "Love and Death," by William H. Hayne; "An April Birthday at Sea," by James Russell Lowell; "Washington Society," by Henry Louis Nelson; "Retribution," by Howard Pyle; "Kansas—1841-1891," by John James Ingalls; "The Refugees" (a tale of two continents), by A. Conan Doyle; "The Progress of Art in New York," by George Parsons Lathrop; "The Storm-Wind," by Arlo Bates; "Horace Chase," by Constance Fenimore Woolson; "A Violet Speaks," by Louise Chandler Moulton; "In the Barracks of the Czar," by Poultney Bigelow; "A Modern Knight," by Emily Browne Powell; "University Extension in Canterbury," by Rebecca Harding Davis; "The Story of the Buffalo," by Hamlin Russell; "Editor's Study," "Editor's Drawer."

THE April Number of THE CENTURY contains: "The Chicago Anarchists of 1886: The Crime, the Trial, and the Punishment," Joseph E. Gary; "The Princess Anne," M. O. W. Oliphant; "An Embassy to Provence," III., Thomas A. Janvier; "Letters of Two Brothers," William Tecumseh Sherman, John Sherman; "A Tree Museum," M. C. Robbins; "The Heart of the Tree," H. C. Bunner; "I've never feared for my Old Man," Jennie E. T. Dowe; "Margaret Fuller," Josephine Lazarus; "Sweet Bells Out of Tune," Mrs. Burton Harrison; "The Cash Capital of Sunset City," Hayden Carruth, "Idy," Margaret Collier Graham; "Benefits Forgotten," Wolcott Balestier; "The Angel of Death Staying the Hand of the Sculptor," Daniel Chester French.

The contents of SCRIBNER'S for April are: "A Century Ago," drawn by A. B. Wenzell; "An Artist in Japan," by Robert Blum; "Epitaph," by Graham R. Tomson; "An Irish Peasant Song," by Louise Imogen Guiney; "Unpublished Letters of Carlyle," "A New England Farm," by Frank French; "The One I Knew the Best of All" (a memory of the mind of a child), by Frances Hodgson Burnett, Chapters XI-XII; "The Restoration House," by Stephen T. Aveling; "Worth While," by Edward S. Martin; "In Rented Rooms," by George I. Putnam; "The Cities that were Forgotten," by Charles F. Lummis; "A Glimpse of an Artist," by Viola Roseboro; "Anne of Brittany's Châteaux in the Valley of the Loire," by Theodore Andrea Cook; "The Arts Relating to Women and

their Exhibition in Paris," by Octave Uzanne; "Historic Moments: The Crisis of the Shipka Pass," by Archibald Forbes; "The Point of View."

LIPPINCOTT'S for April contains as its complete story "Columbus in Love." It also contains the usual number of short stories and interesting articles on timely topics.

The contents of THE COSMOPOLITAN for April are: "The Conqueror," "Sohnl" (poem), Sir Edwin Arnold; "Lent among the Mahometans," Frank G. Carpenter; "Purses, Pockets and Personal Receptacles," S. William Beck; "The University of Chicago," Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen; "Dorastus," Gertrude Hall; "Historic Figure-Heads," Robert G. Denig; "Ice" (poem), Titus Munson Coan; "A Traveller from Altruria," W. D. Howells; "Evolution" (poem), Henry Tyrrell; "The Great Florida Phosphate Boom," Alfred Allen; "Sound in Silence" (poem), Richard Burton; "Inaugurations and Coronations," Frederick S. Daniel; "Berliners," Friedrich Spielhagen; "Surrender" (poem), Julia Boynton Green; "Democracy and City Government," Edwin A. Curley; "Omega: The Last Days of the World," Camille Flammarion.

## MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE, CHRONICLE, OBITUARY, AND CALENDAR.

COMPILED BY THE REV. GEORGE W. GILMORE, M.A.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

**Almanach** des Missions pour 1893. Paris: Brouwer, 1893. Pp. 81, 4to.

**Althaus**, Paul. Die historischen und dogmatischen Grundlagen der lutherischen Tauffirgung. Vortrag. Hannover: Feesche, 1893. Pp. iii, 102, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

**Alvares**, P. P. Santa Catarina de Sena. Madrid, 1893. Pp. lix., 524, 4to. [6.40 mk.]

**Annuaire** du Protestantisme français par E. Davaine. Précédé de la législation des cultes protestants par A. Lods. 1<sup>re</sup> Année. Paris: Fischbacher, 1893. Pp. 504, 8vo, 5 fr.

**André**, T. L'Esclavage chez les anciens Hébreux. Etude d'archéologie biblique. Paris: Fischbacher, 1893. Pp. 199, 8vo, 3.50 fr.

**Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter.** The Greek Text, revised edition, with some corrections from the ms. London: Macmillan, 1893. 8vo, 1s.

**Arbellot**, Abbé. Étude Biographique sur Guillaume Lamy, Patriarche de Jérusalem. Paris: Haton, 1893. Pp. 32, 8vo.

**Aubry**, J. B. Les Grands Séminaires, essai sur la méthode des études ecclésiastiques en France. II. Partie. Les Grands Séminaires. Lille: Desclée, 1893. Pp. 702, 8vo.

**Audisio**, G., Prof. Histoire civile et religieuse des papes de S. Léon III. à Boniface VIII. Traduit de l'italien par le chanoine Labis. Bruges: de Brouwer, 1893. Pp. 464, 8vo.

**Balling**, C. Jerusalem Tempel. Med et Grundrids af Tempelpladsen. Kjøbenhavn: Schönborg, 1893. Pp. 18, 8vo, 40 ore.

**Balme**, François. Cartulaire ou histoire diplomatique de Saint-Dominique, avec illustrations documentaires, publiées et commentées par —, avec la collaboration du R. Père Lefaidier. 3. fasc.: Actes de 1206 à 1212. 8<sup>e</sup> fasc.: Actes de 1212-1213. Paris: Goupy, 1893. Pp. 147-428, 8vo, 6 fr.



**Barry, Alfred, D.D.** *Some Lights of Science on the Faith.* Eight lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1892 on the Bampton Foundation. London and New York: Longmans, 1892. Pp. xvi, 348, 8vo, 12s. 6d., \$3.00.

**Bataille, Dr.** *Le Diable au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle, on les Mystères du spiritisme. Occultisme moderne, Magie de la Rose-Croix. Pratiques sataniques, etc. Récits d'un témoin.* Edition illustrée. Livraisons 1 à 14. Paris: Delhomme, 1893. Pp. 1-112, 4to, 1.40 fr.

**Beale, L. S.** *Our Morality and the Moral Question, Chiefly from the Mediæval Side.* 3d ed. London: Churchill, 1893. Pp. 234, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

**Berger, Elis.** *Saint Louis et Innocent IV. Étude sur les rapports de la France et du Saint-Siège.* Paris: Morin, 1893. Pp. iii., 433, 8vo.

**Berguer, H.** *Sermons et études bibliques. Sur la route d'Emmaüs. La Transfiguration. Gethsémani.* Genève: Eggiman, 1893. Pp. 366, 12mo, 3.50 fr.

**Berthier, R. P.** *L'Étude de la Somme théologique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin.* Freiburg: Univ. Buchhandlung, 1893. Pp. xxiii., 333, 8vo, 6 mk.

**Besold, C.** *Oriental Diplomacy; being the transliterated Text of the Cuneiform Despatches between the Kings of Egypt and Western Asia in the XVth Century before Christ. With full vocabulary, grammatical notes, etc.* London: 1892. Pp. 169, 8vo, 21s. 6d.

**Bickersteth, A.** *The Harmony of History.* London: Low, 1893. 4to, 2s. 6d. [Chronological Tables of History, B C. 1000-322.]

**Bleeh, E.** *Gottes Verkehr mit der geistigen Welt.* Leipzig: Bredt, 1893. Pp. viii., 138, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

**Boies, Henry M., M.A.** *Prisoners and Paupers. A study of the abnormal increase of criminals and the public burden of pauperism in the United States; the causes and remedies.* New York: Putnam, 1893. Pp. xiii, 318, 12mo, \$1.50.

**Bournand, François.** *Le Clergé pendant la Commune (1871).* Paris: Tobra, 1893. Pp. 374, 8vo.

**Breuls, A., Abbé.** *Eglises et Paroisses d'Armagnac: Eauzan, Gabardan, et Albret, d'après une enquête de 1546.* Auch: Foix, 1893. Pp. 168, 8vo.

**Briggs, C. A., D.D.** *The Case against Professor Briggs.* In 2 parts. Part 2. New York: Scribners, 1893. Pp. iv., 161, 8vo, paper, 50 cts.

**Bright, J. W.** *The Gospel of St. Luke in Anglo-Saxon.* Edited from the manuscripts with an introduction, notes and a glossary. London: Frowde, 1893. Pp. 166, 8vo, 5s.

**Brooke, Stopford A., Rev. (comp.)** *Christian Hymns.* New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 362, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

**Brooks, Phillips, Rt. Rev.** *Brilliant from the Writings of the —.* Boston: Hollander, 1893. Pp. viii., 39, 24mo, cl., 50 cts. [Also] *Service in Loving Memory of —, at Music Hall, New York, Feb. 16, 1893.* New York: Whittaker, 1893. Pp. vi., 47, 8vo, paper, 25 cts.

**Bugge, C. A.** *Udviklingslaerens moral. En fremstilling og kritik.* Kristiania: Cammermeyer, 1893. Pp. v., 332, 8vo, 4.25 kr.

**Buisson, Ferdinand.** *Sébastien Castellion: sa vie et son œuvre (1515-1563). Étude sur les origines du protestantisme libéral français.* 2 vols. Paris: Hachette, 1893. Pp. xix., 441, 516, 8vo, 20 fr.

**Caird, Edward, LL.D., D.C.L.** *The Evolution of Religion. The Gifford Lectures delivered before the University of St. Andrews in sessions 1890-91 and 1891-92.* In 2 vols. Glasgow: Maclehose; New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. xv., 400; xii., 334, 12mo, 14, \$4.00.

**Calderwood, H.** *Evolution and Man's Place in Nature.* London: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 340, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

**Candlish, J. S.** *The Biblical Doctrine of Sin.* Edinburgh: Clarke, 1893. Pp. 128, p. 8vo, 1s. 6d. (*Handbooks for Bible Classes.*)

**Catergian, Joseph, Dr.** *De fidel symbolo, quo Armenii utuntur, observationes. Opus posthumum.* Wien: Kirsch, 1893. Pp. 53, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

**Cassel, P.** *Gesammelte Schriften. I. Band. Das Leben des Menschen in Geschichte und Symbol.* Berlin: Boll, 1893. Pp. xv., 454, 8vo, 10 mk.

**Cetillier, H., Abbé.** *Le Problème spiritualiste; l'existence de l'âme. Conférences adressées aux étudiants de Rennes.* Paris: Delhomme, 1893. Pp. 287, 12mo.

**Chapot, Léon, Abbé.** *Histoire de la vénérable Mère Marie de l'Incarnation, première supérieure du monastère des Ursulines de Québec, d'après dom Claude Martin, son fils, religieux bénédictin de la congrégation de Saint-Maur.* Ouvrage entièrement remanié, complété à l'aide de plusieurs autres historiens et documents, et précédé d'une introduction générale. Paris: Poussielge, 1893. 2 vols. Pp. xi., 452; 477, 8vo.

**Costa, Joseph, Dr.** *Ein Kranz um das Kreuz. Eine Reihe von Homilien über die Passion des Herrn nach Matthäus. [Also] Aus dem Leben und Leiden des Herrn. Drei Cyklen von Vorträgen an gebildete Katholiken.* Kempten: Kosel, 1893. Pp. vii., 248; xiii., 272, 8vo, 2.40 mk. and 2.50 mk.

**Cox, W. L. P.** *The Scientific Study of Theology.* London: Skeffington, 1893. Pp. 178, p. 8vo, 4s. 6d.

**Darmesteter, Jacques, Prof.** *Le Zend-Avesta. Traduction nouvelle, avec commentaire historique et philologique.* 2<sup>e</sup> volume: *la Loi (Vendidad); l'Épopée (Yasht); le Livre de prière (Khorda-Avesta).* Paris: Leroux, 1893. Pp. xxxv., 752, 4to, 20 fr.

**Davaine, Edmond.** *Annuaire du protestantisme français. Précédé de la législation des cultes protestants, par Armand Lods, docteur en droit.* 1<sup>re</sup> Année, 1893. Paris: Fishbacher, 1893. Pp. 504, 8vo, 5 fr.

**Doissmann, G. Adf.** *Die Neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu" untersucht.* Marburg i. H.: Elwert, 1893. Pp. x., 136, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

**De la Roi, J. F. A.** *Die Mission der evangelischen Kirche in Israel. (Zimmer's Handbibliothek der praktischen Theologie, Band 16.)* Gotha: Perthes, 1893. Pp. vii., 147, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

**Delitzsch, F. und Haupt, P.** *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft. II. Band. 2. Heft.* Leipzig: Hirsch, 1893. Pp. 273-556, 8vo, 30 mk.

**Desailly, Abbé.** *Le Paradis terrestre et la Race nègre devant la science.* Paris: Delhomme, 1893. Pp. 323, 12mo.

**Dix, Morgan, Rev.** *The Sacramental System considered as the Extension of the Incarnation.* New York: Longmans, 1893. Pp. 290, 8vo, cloth, \$1.50. [Bishop Paddock Lectures for 1892.]

**Dodd, Arnold, Ph.D.** *Moses or Darwin? Translated by Frederick W. Dodd.* New York: Commonwealth Co., 1893. Pp. 326, 12mo.

**Do the Dead Return? A Record of Experiences in Spiritualism.** By a clergyman of the Church of England. London: Unwin, 1898. Pp. 122, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

**Doumergue, E. Prof.** *Le Problème Protestant. Réponse à un Catholique.* Montauban: Graine, 1893. Pp. 138, 16mo.

**Drews, Paul.** *Petrus Canisius, der erste deutsche Jesuit. (Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte, Nr. 38.)* Halle: Niemeyer, 1893. Pp. 189, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

**Dutray, Abbé.** *Syncretisme des religions, on rapport, rapprochement, conciliation, analogie, concordance des diverses religions du globe, une dans leurs principes.* Châteaudun: Prudhomme, 1893. Pp. 162, iv., fo.

**Evans, Elizabeth E.** *A History of Religions. Being a Condensed Statement of the Results of Scientific Research and Philosophical Criticism.* New York: Commonwealth Co., 1893. Pp. 128, 12mo.

**Feingold, Solomon ben David.** *Hymn Book of the Paris Mission to the Jews.* Paris: Reiff, 1893. Pp. 48, 18mo.

**Fell, Georg.** *Antonio Baldinucci. Ein Bild aus dem Leben der Kirche zu Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts. Zur Feier der Seligsprechung.* Regensburg: Pustet, 1893. Pp. viii., 184, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

**Fisher, George Park, D.D.** *A Manual of Natural Theology.* New York: Scribners, 1893. Pp. ix., 94, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

**Fillet, L. Abbé.** *Histoire Religieuse du Canton de la Chapelle en-Vercors (Drôme).* Valence: Vercein, 1893. Pp. 303, 8vo.

**Flemming, W.** *Zur Beurtheilung des Christentums Justins des Märtyrers.* Leipzig: Dörfling, 1893. Pp. iv., 76, 8vo, 1.30 mk.

**Fontan, Abbé.** *L'Eglise et la France.* Tarbes: Crohard, 1893. Pp. 157, 8vo, 1 fr.

**Foot, Henry W., Rev.** *The Insight of Faith: Selections from Sermons.* Boston: Ellis, 1893. Pp. 115, 16mo, cloth, 50 cts.

**Forcella, V.** *Iscrizioni delle chiese e degli altri edifici di Milano, dal secolo VIII. ai giorni nostri.* Vol. xi. Milan, 1892. Pp. 242, 8vo. [16 mk.]

**Fouard, C.** *Saint Paul, ses Missions.* Paris, 1892. Pp. xvii., 544, 8vo, 7.50 fr.

**Freund, W., und Marx.** *Präparationen zum Alten Testament. Zum Gebrauch für die Schule und den Privatunterricht.* 7. Abtheilung, 1. Heft. *Präparation zu Jeremia cap 1-19.* Leipzig: Violet, 1893. Pp. 80, 12mo, 75 pf. [i-vii., 1, 14.25 mk.]

**Frey, A.** *L'Interprétation de l'Apocalypse de Saint-Jean.* 2<sup>e</sup> et dernière partie. Genève: Burckhardt, 1893. Pp. 160, 8vo, 1.50 fr.

**Frins, P. Victor.** *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis doctrina de co-operatione dei cum omni natura creata praesertim libera, seu S. Thomas praedeterminationis physicae ad omnem actionem creatam adversarius. "Responsio ad R. P. F. A. M. Dunmer-muth Praedeterminationis physicae defensorem."* Paris: Lethielleux, 1893. Pp. 498, 8vo, 8.80 fr.

**Gambrell, Theo. C., D.D.** *Studies in the Civil, Social, and Ecclesiastical History of Early Maryland: Lectures Delivered to the Young Men of the Agricultural College of Maryland.* New York: Whittaker, 1893. Pp. iii., 240, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

**Ganse, Hervey Doddridge.** *Poems and Hymns. With an Introduction by Herrick Johnson, D.D.* Chicago: Y. M. E. Pub. Co., 1893. Pp. iii., 90, 4, 8vo, cloth, \$1.00.

**Ganser, Ant.** *Der reine Gottesbegriff und dessen Wichtigkeit. Fortsetzung und Schluss des Werkes "Schule und Staat."* Graz: Leuschner, 1893. Pp. 46, 8vo, 1 mk.

**Gordon, A. J., D.D.** *The Holy Spirit in Missions. Six lectures.* New York: Revell, 1893. Pp. 241, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

**Gourmont, R. de.** *Le Latin mystique. Les poètes de l'Antiphonaire et la Symbolique au moyen âge.* Préface de J. K. Huyomana. Paris: Vanier, 1893. Pp. xvi., 379, 8vo.

**Grau, R. F.** *Worauf es in dem Streit um das Apostolikum ankommt.* Vortrag. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1893. Pp. 28, 8vo, 40 pf.

**Graue, G. H., Dr.** *Die selbständige Stellung der Sittlichkeit zur Religion.* Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1893. Pp. vi., 219, 8vo, 5 mk.

**Green, E. T.** *Notes on the Teaching of St. Paul, with an Analysis of the Epistle to the Romans.* London: Skedington, 1893. Pp. 44, p. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

**Greenwald, E., Rev. D.D.** *Meditations for the Closet.* Philadelphia: Frederick, 1893. Pp. 153, 12mo, 40 cts.

**Gregory of Nyssa.** *Dogmatic Treatises, etc., edited by William A. Moore and translated by Henry Austin Wilson. Vol. V. of a select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2d series: edited by Philip Schaff, D.D., and Henry Wace, D.D.* New York: Christian Literature Co., 1893. Pp. xiv., 567, 8vo, cloth, \$3.00.

**Grünbaum, M.** *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sagenkunde.* Leiden: Brill, 1893. Pp. iii., 391, 8vo, 7.50 mk.

**Grünwald, M., Rabbi, Dr.** *Ueber den Einfluss der Psalmen auf die christliche Liturgie und Hymnologie mit steter Rücksichtnahme auf talmudisch-midrassische Literatur.* 4. Heft. Frankfurt a.M.: Kaufmann, 1893. Pp. 69-124, 8vo, 2 mk. [1-4, 5 mk.]

**Gunning, J. H.** *Wat is het geloof? Eene overdenking.* 2<sup>e</sup> druk. Nijmegen: ten Hooft, 1893. Pp. 154, 8vo, 1 fl.

**Guzmán, P. L. de.** *Historia de las misiones de la compañía de Jesus en la India Oriental, en la China y Japon desde 1540 hasta 1600.* Bilbao: 1892. Pp. 674, 4to. [16 mk.]

**Haeckel, Ernst.** *Der Monismus als Band zwischen Religion und Wissenschaft. Glaubensbekenntnis eines Naturforschers.* Bonn: Strauss, 1893. Pp. 46, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

**Halévy, J.** *Recherches Bibliques, 13<sup>e</sup> fascicule.* Versailles: Cerf, 1893. Pp. 685-742, 8vo.

**Hall, Bp.** *Christ Mystical: or, the Blessed Union of Christ and His Members. From General Gordon's copy. With an introduction on the theology of General Gordon by the Rev. Caruthers Wilson.* London: Hodder, 1893. Pp. 170, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

**Harris, H. Richard.** *Phillips Brooks. His Character and Teachings.* New York: Whitaker, 1893. Pp. 28, 12mo, 25 cts.

**Hart, Burdette, D.D.** *Studies of the Model Life. Essays on the Various Aspects of Christ.* New York: Treat, 1893. Pp. 300, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

**Hase, Karl von.** *Kirchengeschichte auf der Grundlage akademischer Vorlesungen.* 3 Theil, 2. Abtheilung, 2. Hälfte. I. und II. Herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. G. Krüger. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1893. Pp. iii., 359-1023, 8vo, 6 mk. [Also] *Gesammelte Werke.* 8. Band, 2. Halbband, 2. Theil. *Theologische Streit- und Zeitschriften.* 2. Abtheilung. *Theologische Aehrenlese.* Herausgegeben von G.

Frank. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1893. Pp. 387-624, 8vo, mk.

Hergenroether, Cardinal. Histoire de l'Eglise. Bibliothèque théologique du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle, rédigée par les principaux docteurs des universités catholiques. Traduction de l'abbé P. Bélet. Vol. VII. Paris: Palmé, 1893. Pp. 463, 8vo, 7,50 fr.

Herrmann, W. Worum handelt es sich in dem Streit um das Apostolikum? Mit besonderen Rücksicht auf Dr. Cremer's Streitschrift beantwortet. (Hefte zur Christlichen Welt, Nr. 4.) Leipzig: Grunow, 1893. Pp. 36, 8vo, 40 pf.

Hodges, G. Christianity between Sundays. London: Dickinson, 1893. Cr. 8vo, 4s.

Hokstra, H. Uit de fonteynen des Hells. Utrecht: 1893. Pp. iv., 463, 8vo. [75 mk.]

Hilgworth, J. R. University and Cathedral Sermons. New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. vi., 223, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

In Spirit and in Truth. Essays by Younger Ministers of the Unitarian Church. With an Introduction by Rev. James De Normandie. Boston: Ellis, 1893. Pp. ii., 163, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00. [Contains The Philosophy of Religion, by Rev. George Crosswell Cressey; The Revelation of God in Nature, by Rev. L. D. Cochran; The Bible as Literature and Revelation, by Rev. W. W. Fenn; The Thought of God in the Bible, by Rev. Francis B. Hornbrooke; The Revelation of God in Man, by Rev. S. M. Crothers; The Christ, by Rev. Albert Walkley; The Use of Liturgy in Worship, by Rev. John Taulis.]

Irish Catholic Directory and Almanac for 1893, with Directory for the Lally. Dublin: Duffy, 1893. Cr. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

James, Constantin, Docteur. Moïse et Darwin. L'Homme de la Genèse comparé à l'homme-singe; l'Enseignement religieux opposé à l'enseignement athée. Paris: Brouwer, 1893. Pp. v., 400, 8vo.

Jawett, Henry E., Rev. Israel Edson Dwinell, D.D. A memoir with sermons. Oakland: Hardy, 1893. 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Joseph, M. The Ideal in Judaism, and other Sermons Preached during 1890-92. London: Nutt, 1893. Pp. 314, 12mo, 5s.

Katholische, Flugschriften, zur Wehr und Lehr. Nr. 66. Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis und seine Bestreiter. Berlin: Germania, 1893. Pp. 64, 16mo, 10 pf.

Kawerau, Waldemar. Die Reformation und die Ehe. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des 16. Jahrhunderts. (Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte, Nr. 39.) Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 1893. Pp. vi., 104, 8vo, 1,20 mk.

Kayser, K. Das Buch von der Erkenntnis der Wahrheit oder der Ursache aller Ursachen. Aus dem syrischen Grundtext ins Deutsche übersetzt. Strassburg i.E.: Trübner, 1893. Pp. xxiii., 367, 8vo, 15 mk.

Kinsler, A. Das Schriftzeugnis von Jesus dem Sohne Gottes, kurz dargelegt. Basel: Missionsbuchhandlung, 1893. Pp. iv., 60, 8vo, 80 pf.

Kreschnicka, J. Der Tag des letzten Abendmahles Christi. Eine harmonisch-exegetische Studie. Program des niederösterreichischen Landes-Real- und Obergymnasiums. Horn: Gymnasiums, 1893. Pp. 49, 8vo.

Kuonen, A. Historisch-critisch Onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds, uitgegeven door J. C. Matthes. 2de uitgave, 2de deel. De poetische boeken des Ouden Verbonds. 1. Stuk. De psalmen en de gnomische geschriften. Leiden: Engels, 1893. Pp. xii., 309, 8vo, 2,60 fl.

Labbé, E. Renaissance des idées morales. Paris: Lelagave, 1893. Pp. 67, 8vo.

Lamaire, E. La Vie du Bouddha, suivie du Bouddhisme dans l'Indochine. Paris: Carré, 1893. Pp. 392, 8vo, 4 fr. [Also: Théologie hindoue. Le Prem Sagar, océan d'amour. Traduit par —. Paris: Carré, 1893. Pp. xlix., 332, 8vo.

Lamont, T. Johnston, Rev. The Joy of Salvation. Rockford, Ill.: Monitor Pub. Co., 1893. Pp. 123, 12mo.

Laville, A., Abbé. L'Eglise et les belles-lettres. Études sur le progrès littéraire dans les sociétés chrétiennes. Paris: Vlc, 1893. Pp. x., 367, 16mo.

Lea, Henry C. Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary. Philadelphia: Lea: 1893. Pp. 221, 8vo, cloth, \$2.50.

Leach, C. Old yet ever new Lessons for Daily Life from the Old Testament. Being a series of sermons and addresses for working men. London: Dickinson, 1893. Pp. 296, p. 8vo, 5s.

Le Blanc d'Amboine, Prosper. Le Livre de la sagesse et les Psaumes cix à cxvi, allégoriquement expliqués. Précédés d'une introduction par le vicomte François de Salignac Fénelon. Nantes: Grimaud, 1893. Pp. xix., 235, 8vo.

Look, W. John Keble. A biography. With a portrait from a painting by George Richmond. London: Methuen; Boston: Houghton, 1893. Pp. v., 245, p. 8vo, 5s., \$1.00.

Lods, Adolphe. Evangelii secundum Petrum et Petri Apocalypses que supersunt ad fidem codicis in Aegypto nuper inventi, edidit cum latina versione et dissertatione critica. Paris: Leroux, 1893. Pp. 65, 8vo.

Loserth, J. Der Anabaptismus in Tirol vom Jahre 1536 bis zu seinem Erlöschen. Aus den hinterlassenen Papieren des Dr. Jos. R. Von Beck. Wien: Tempeky, 1893. Pp. 150, 8vo, 3 mk.

Luckock, H. M. The Church in Scotland. With maps. London: Gardner, 1893. Pp. 384, p. 8vo, 6s. (National Churches series.)

Luzzato, S. D. Hebräische Briefe gesammelt von seinem Sohne Dr. Isaias Luzzato. Herausgegeben von Elsig Gräber. VIII. Band. Wien: Lippe, 1893. Pp. 1077-1250, 8vo, 2,40 mk. [Bände VI.-VIII., 6,40 mk.]

Macduff, John R., D.D. The Pillar in the Night. New York: Armstrong, 1893. Pp. xiv., 336, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

McGarvey, J. W., A.M. New Commentary on Acts of the Apostles. Vol. II. Cincinnati: Standard Pub. Co., 1893. Pp. ii., 298, 8vo, \$1.50.

Mackenzie, J. M. Mrs. The Flowers of the Home. London: Simpkin, 1893. Pp. 50, 12mo, 6d. [Religious Sketches for the Young.]

Maclaren, A., Rev. D.D. The Psalms. Vol. I. Psalms I.-xxviii. (Expositor's Bible. Edited by Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D.) London: Hodder; New York: Armstrong, 1893. Pp. viii., 385, 8vo, \$1.50.

Maher, M. Recent Evidence for the Authenticity of the Gospels: Tatian's Diatessaron. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1893. Pp. 84, 12mo, 6d.

Mahn, P. Die Mystik des Angelus Silesius. Inaugural Dissertation des Universitäts Rostock. Paderborn: 1892. Pp. 63, 8vo.

Martin, O. Die unbefleckte Empfängnis der Maria. Aus dem Spanisch von Osk. Panizza. Zürich: Verlags Magazin, 1893. Pp. xii., 105, 8vo, 1,60 mk.

**Mauss, C.** L'Eglise de Saint-Jérémie. à Abon Goeh. Observations sur plusieurs mesures de l'antiquité (III.). Paris: Leroux, 1893. Pp. 127-129, 8vo.

**Menant, Joschim.** Les Yézidiz. Episodes de l'histoire des adorateurs du diable. Paris: Leroux, 1893. Pp. viii, 323, 18mo, 3.50 fr.

**Mermind, W.** Essai sur l'idée de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament. Dissertation. Genève: Beroud, 1893. Pp. 44, 8vo, 50 cts.

**Meyer, F. B., Rev.** Moses the Servant of God. New York: Revell, 1893. Pp. 190, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

**Meyer, Paulus.** Wölfe im Schafsfell-Schafe im Wolfspelz! Enthüllungen über die Judenmission und eine Abrechnung mit Prof. Strack. Leipzig: Rust, 1893. Pp. x., 94, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

**Milligan, W.** Discussions on the Apocalypse. London: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 300, p. 8vo, 5s. [Published in 1886, as appendices to the Baird Lectures.]

**Møller, O.** Den Kristelige Vished eller "Troens fulde Forvæntning" (Smaaskrifter til Oplysning for Kristne, udgivne af F. Nielsen, vii., 2.) Kjøbenhavn: Schouberg, 1893. Pp. 102, 8vo, 1.65 kr.

**Montefiore, C. G.** The Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews. (Hibbert Lectures.) New York: Scribners, 1893. Pp. 593, 8vo, cloth, \$3.00.

**Musick, John R.** The Pilgrims. A story of Massachusetts. New York: Funk, 1893. Pp. ix., 363, 12mo, \$1.50.

**Myśkowski, Titus, Dr.** Chronologica-historica introductio in Novum Testamentum. Lemberg: Gubrynowicz, 1893. Pp. vii., 179, 8vo, 4 mk.

**Odlin, James E., Rev.** New Concepts of Old Dogmas. A book of sermons. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1893. Pp. 232, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

**Nathusius, Martin von, Prof., Dr.** Die Mitarbeit der Kirche an der Lösung der sozialen Frage. I. Die soziale Frage. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1893. Pp. viii., 310, 8vo, 5 mk.

**Norton, P.** Seven Lamps of Fire; or, The Sevenfold Gifts of the Holy Ghost. With a preface by Rev. Frances Gell, and an appendix containing a selection of sentences from the Pentecostal Sermons of Bishop Andrewes. London: Nisbet, 1893. 18mo, 1s.

**Nygaard, F.** Luthers Venner. Kirkehistoriske Nutids-Skizzer fra Vest-Tyskland og Elsass. Odense: Milo, 1892. Pp. 442, 8vo, 4 kr.

**Parker, Joseph, D. D.** The People's Bible. Vol. 18. Matt. I.-xi. London: Hazell, 1893. Pp. 456, 8vo, 8s.

**Perruchon, J.** Vie de Lalibala, roi d'Ethiopie. Texte éthiopien, publié d'après un manuscrit du Musée britannique, et traduction française, avec un résumé de l'histoire des Zaghlés et la description des églises monolithes de Lalibala. Paris: Leroux, 1893. Pp. xlvii., 169, 8vo, 10 fr.

**Petrie, W. M. F.** Coptic Manuscripts brought from the Fayum. Edited with commentaries and indices by W. E. Crum. London: Natt, 1893. 4to, 7s. 6d.

**Pfister, Michael.** Friedrich von Schreiber, Erzbischof von Bamberg. Eine Lebensskizze. Bamberg: Schmidt, 1893. Pp. 57, 8vo, 75 pf.

**Photii patriarche opusculum paræneticum.** Appendix gnomica. Excerpta Parisina. Editio Leo Sternbach. Krakau: Verlagsgesellschaft, 1893. Pp. 82, 8vo, 3 mk.

**Powers, I. H.** Kritische Bemerkungen zu Lotze's Seelenbegriff. Dissertation. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1893. Pp. 49, 8vo, 1 mk.

**Rainy, R.** The Epistle to the Philippians. (Expositor's Bible.) London: Hodder; New York: Armstrong, 1893. Pp. viii., 370, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.; \$1.50.

**Rawlinson, R., and Macray, G. M.** Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae, Pars Quinte fasciculus tertius: Viri magnificentissimi. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893. 4to, 21s.

**Rivier, Th.** Etude sur la révélation chrétienne. Lausanne: Payot, 1894. Pp. 125, 8vo, 2 fr.

**Roberty, E. de.** Agnosticisme. Essai sur quelques théories pessimistes de la connaissance. Paris: Alcan, 1893. Pp. vi., 165, 18mo, 2 50 fr.

**Roger-Miles, L.** Michael-Ange: sa vie, son œuvre, suivi du catalogue de ses principales œuvres. Paris: Rouam, 1893. Pp. 116, 4to, 3.50 fr.

**Rohleder, Theodor.** Politisch-religiöse Grundlage für das Einzige Christentum. Mit einem Begleitwort von M. von Egidy. Esslingen: Languth, 1893. Pp. vi., 89, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

**Ryland, F.** Ethics: an introductory manual for the use of University students. London: Bell, 1893. Pp. 218, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

**Ryle, Herbert E.** Ezra and Nehemiah, with introduction and notes. (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.) New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. lxxii., 380, 16mo, cloth, \$1.25.

**Savage, Minot J., Rev.** Psychics: Facts and Figures. Boston: Arena Pub. Co., 1893. Pp. v., 153, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

**Schauz, P.** Die Lehre von den heiligen Sacramenten der katholischen Kirche. Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1893. Pp. viii., 757, 8vo, 10 mk.

**Schneider, H. G.** Gnadenhal, die erste evangelische Missionstation in Afrika. [Die gute Botschaft. Missionstraktate der Brüdergemeinde, Nr. 5.] Stuttgart: Roth, 1893. Pp. iv., 191, 8vo, 75 pf.

**Scholten.** Was uns noth thut. Betrachtungen über den Abfall grosser Massen evangelischer Christen vom Christentum zum Atheismus. Naumburg a. S.: Schirmer, 1893. Pp. 63, 8vo, 1 mk.

**Shedd, William G. T., D. D.** Calvinism: pure and mixed. A defence of the Westminster Standards. New York: Scribners, 1893. Pp. viii., 164, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

**Sidebotham, H.** The Pastoral Visitation of the Sick and Suffering. London: Gardner, 1893. Pp. 186, p. 8vo, 5s.

**Skopnik, A., Dr.** Politik und Christentum. Eine religiös-politische Studie. Berlin: Skopnik, 1893. Pp. iv., iii., 220, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

**Smith, Henry Preserved, D. D.** Inspiration and Inerrancy. A history and a defence. Containing the original papers on Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration. Cincinnati: Clarke, 1893. Pp. 374, 8vo, \$1.50.

**Smith, Samuel, M. P.** The Credibility of the Christian Religion; or, Thoughts on Modern Rationalism. Boston: Hastings, 1893. Pp. xii., 98, 12mo.

**Soden, Frdr. von.** Und Frieden auf Erden. Ein wort zum Streit uns Apostolikum. Berlin: Haack, 1893. Pp. 24, 8vo, 50 pf.

**Spieess, Julius.** Das Verhältnis von Apostelgeschichte XV. zu Galater 2. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Parteilichkeiten im Urchristentum. Program des gymnasiums zu Crefeld. Crefeld, 1892. Pp. 12, 4to.

**Spurgeon, C. H.** Words of Wisdom for Daily



Life. London: Passmore, 1893. Pp. 160, p. 8vo, 2s.

**Stephen, Leslie.** An Agnostic's Apology, and Other Essays. New York: Putnam, 1893. Pp. iv., 380, 8vo, cloth, \$2.50.

**Sussann, Hermann, Dr. Jakob Otter.** Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Reformation. Tauberscheidt: Lang, 1893. Pp. vi., 70, 8vo, 75 pf.

**Thoburn, J. M., Bishop.** The Deaconess and Her Vocation. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1893. Pp. vi., 127, 12mo, cloth, 60 cts. [Sermons and Addresses.]

**Thomas, Abbé.** Le Règne du Christ, l'Eglise militante et les derniers. Temps. Paris: Blond, 1893. Pp. vi., 334, 8vo.

**Torrey, R. A.** How to Bring Men to Christ. New York: Revell, 1893. Pp. 121, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

**Vaughan, C. J.** Restful Thoughts in Restless Times. London: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 322, p. 8vo, 5 s. [Sermons at the Temple Church and at Llandaff Cathedral.]

**Vigouroux, F.** Dictionnaire de la Bible, contenant tous les noms de personnes, de lieux, de plantes, d'animaux, mentionnés dans les saintes Ecritures, etc., publié par—, avec le concours d'un grand nombre de collaborateurs. Fascicule 3: Animaux-Archéologie. Paris: Letouzey, 1893. Pp. 609-928, 8vo.

**Wake, Archbishop.** The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers. London: Routledge, 1893. Pp. 370, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d. [Sir John Lubbock's Hundred Books.]

**Wakeford, J.** Behold the Man! Nine addresses wherein is set forth the human nature of our Divine Lord as the instrument of our Salvation. With an introduction by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Chichester. London: Gardner, 1893. Pp. 154, 18mo, 2s.

**Warren, Henry White, S.T.D.** The Bible in the World's Education. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1893. Pp. ii., 320, 12mo, \$1.00.

**Wendt, H. H.** Die Norm des Echten Christenthums. (Hefte zur "Christlichen Welt," Nr. 5.) Leipzig: Grunow, 1893. Pp. 51, 8vo, 50 pf.

**White, Wilbert W.** Inductive Studies in the Twelve Minor Prophets. Chicago: G. M. Era Pub. Co., 1893. Pp. 114, 16mo, cloth, 50 cts.

**Wide, S.** Lakonische Kulte. Leipzig: Teubner, 1893. Pp. x., 417, 8vo, 10 mk.

**Wiesinger, Ch. A. S.** Ueber die Kindtaufe im Zusammenhange ihrer gegebenen Konsequenzen. Dresden: Naumann, 1893. Pp. 32, 8vo, 40 pf.

**Willink, Arthur.** The World of the Unseen. An essay on the relation of higher space to things eternal. London and New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. vi., 84, 12mo, \$1.25, 3s. 6d.

**Woelbing, Gustav, Dr.** Die mittelalterlichen Lebensbeschreibungen des Bonifatius, ihrem Inhalte nach untersucht, verglichen und erläutert. Leipzig: Pock, 1893. Pp. viii., 160, 8vo, 2 mk.

**Wolfe, J. E.** Gold from Ophir. Bible readings. New York: Revell, 1893. Pp. 294, 8vo, cloth, \$1.25.

**Wyzewa, T., de.** Contes Chrétiens. Les Disciples d'Emmaüs, on les Etapes d'une conversion. Paris: Perrin, 1893. Pp. 115, 16mo, 1 fr.

**Zuckermann, B.** Anleitung und Tabellen zur Vergleichung jüdischer und christlicher Zeitangaben. Herausgegeben von M. Brann. Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars Frankfurter Stiftung, 1893. Breslau: Schottlaender, 1893. Pp. 46, 8vo.

## CHRONICLE.

(Closes on the 20th of each month.)

**Feb. 17-March 24.** Delivery of the Bishop Padlock Lectures by Bishop Cox at the General Theological Seminary, New York City. General subject, "The Repose of the Blessed Dead."

**Feb. 21.** Second Negro Conference at Tuskegee.

**Feb. 24.** Sixth Annual Session of the (Methodist Episcopal) Deaconess Conference in Cincinnati.

**Feb. 28-March 2.** Missionary Conference at Philadelphia, under the auspices of the American Baptist Missionary Union.

**March 1-2.** Meeting in New York of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The Rev. John McKim was chosen Missionary Bishop of Yeddo, Japan, and the Rev. Frederick R. Graves Missionary Bishop of Shanghai. A resolution was adopted remonstrating against the resignation of Bishop William Bell White Howe, of South Carolina.

**March 2.** Proclamation of an anathema on the Protestant Episcopal Church by Joseph Renatus Villate, Archbishop of the Old Catholic Church in America.

**March 5.** Installation of the Rev. John R. Davies as successor to Dr. Howard Crosby in the pastorate of the Fourth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City.

**March 6.** Inter-Denominational Ministerial Conference in Toronto, held for the purpose of furthering denominational union.

**March 9.** Incorporation of the Congregational Church Extension Society of New York City and Brooklyn.

Moravian Christian Endeavor Conference in the Sixth Street Moravian Church, New York.

Election of the Rev. Samuel L. Beiler, D.D., Vice-chancellor of the American University at Washington, D.C.

**March 20.** Tri-Centennial in Minneapolis of the issuance of the Decree of Upsala.

The Rev. William Proctor Swaby, D.D., has been appointed Anglican Bishop of Guiana: the Rev. W. W. Perrin, Bishop of British Columbia; and the Rev. W. J. Burn, Bishop of Qu'Appelle.

The Rt. Rev. John Thomas Pelham, D.D., Bishop of Norwich, England, has signified his intention to resign in May.

The Rev. William Irwin, D.D., has resigned as Corresponding Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, and the Rev. J. T. Gibson has resigned the office of Secretary and Treasurer of the Board of Missions for Freedmen, his resignation to take effect June 1st.

The Woman's Executive Committee of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church has appointed Miss Elizabeth M. Wishard, of Indianapolis, Secretary.

The Rev. C. M. Southgate, of Worcester, has been elected New England Secretary of the American Missionary Society.

The Rev. W. H. Black, D.D., of the Missouri Valley College has been called to the Chair of Systematic Theology in the Theological School of Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn. The Rev. J. M. Hubbert, D.D., has accepted the invitation to become Dean of the same; and the Rev. Charles Wells Hayes, D.D., has accepted a call to become professor in the De Lancy Divinity School, Geneva, N. Y.

The Rev. John P. Peters, Ph.D., has resigned the professorship of Hebrew in the University of Pennsylvania, Pa.

The Rev. Professor Todd Martin has been nominated for the moderatorship of the next General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.

Nearly \$150,000 has been secured for the endowment of a new Theological Seminary of the Southern Presbyterian Church at Louisville, Ky., assuring the establishment of the same.

The General Council of the Catholic Summer School has decided to accept the large grant of land at Piatasburg, N. Y., for the location of the school.

## OBITUARY.

Barney, Rev. Stanford Guthrie (Cumberland Presbyterian), D.D., at Lebanon, Tenn., March 1, aged 59. He was graduated from Cumberland College, Princeton, Ky., 1841; ordained to charge of church at Memphis, 1845; became pastor and teacher at Oxford, Miss., 1846; was President of Union Female College, 1852-61; elected Professor of English Literature in the University of Mississippi, 1866; Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Department of Cumberland University, 1877; transferred to the Chair of Systematic Theology, 1881, which position he held till his death. He was moderator of the General Assembly in 1860. He has published "Atonement and Law Reviewed," "Soteriology," "Psychology," "Studies in Moral Science," "Baptismal Regeneration," "Election," and very numerous review articles.

Bells, Rev. Cushing (Congregationalist), D.D. (Pacific University), at Tacoma, Feb. 16, aged 83. He was graduated from Williams College, 1834, and from East Windsor Theological Seminary, 1837; he was appointed to the Zulu mission, but was sent instead to what was then known as Oregon, preaching his first sermon to the Indians at Chawelah, in 1838, where in 1839 he dedicated a church; was stationed at Tshimakian, 1839; removed to the Willamette Valley, 1843; taught for several years in Pacific University, Forest Grove, Ore.; removed in 1861 to Walla Walla; was largely influential in founding Whitman College, being its first teacher, and becoming President of its Board of Trustees, 1872; removed to Colfax, 1877, laboring there and in the vicinity, and establishing churches in Colfax, Cheney, Medical Lake, and elsewhere. He was known on the Pacific slope as "Father Bells."

Evans, Elder Frederick W. (Shaker), at Lebanon, N. Y., March 6, aged 85. He was born in England, but emigrated to the United States in 1830; joined the Shakers in 1830; was appointed Elder of the "North Family," 1838; became "First Elder" of three of the families, 1858; edited the *Shaker and Shakeress*, 1873-75. He was instrumental in developing the economics of the Shaker community, and has published "Compendium of the Principles, Rules, Doctrines, and Government of Shakers, with Biographies of Ann Lee and Others," "Autobiography of a Shaker," "Tests of Divine Revelation," "Shaker Communism," and "Second Appearing of Christ," besides contributing to seventy periodicals.

Horden, Rt. Rev. John (Anglican), D.D. (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1872), near Moose Fort, in the Province of Moosonee, Canada, January 22, aged 66. He was a graduate of Oxford, and after completing his studies, taught in Exeter; was accepted for missionary service, and was sent to what has become the diocese of Moosonee, 1851, receiving ordination in 1852; was consecrated first Bishop of Moosonee in 1872. His diocese was 1200 miles long by 800 wide, and it took him eight years to cover his diocese in his visitations, omitting, in the performance of this duty, no one of the many Indian tribes. He translated the Bible and Prayer-Book into the Cree language, and had just completed a revision of the former when he died.

McFarland, Rev. D. K. (Southern Presbyterian), D.D., at Mayesville, S. C., February 28, aged 45. He was graduated from the University of Mississippi, 1870, and from the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C., 1873; became pastor at Hopewell, S. C., 1873; accepted pastorate of the First Presbyterian Church, Savannah, Ga., 1875; married Miss Annie R. Witherspoon, in January, 1877; accepted call to Oxford, Miss., 1882; removed to Stanton, 1886, resigning on account of ill health, 1894.

Newton, Rev. William (Reformed Episcopalian), D.D., at West Chester, Pa., February 16, 1893. He was educated for the law, but entered the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church, becoming rector of Holy Trinity Church, West Chester, Pa., 1856; removed to Gambier, O., in connection with the Theological Seminary there, 1863; afterward accepted the rectorate of the Church of the Nativity, Philadelphia, which he resigned in 1877, withdrawing from the Protestant Episcopal Communion, and entering the Reformed Episcopal Church; organized the Church of the Covenant in Philadelphia, 1878, and removed to West Chester to take charge of the Church of the Sure Foundation. He was preparing a "Commentary on the Psalms" and a "Commentary on the Book of Revelation," both of which are well advanced toward completion.

Peabody, Rev. Andrew Preston (Unitarian), D.D. (Harvard, 1852), LL.D. (University of Rochester, 1863), in Boston, March 10, aged 82. He was graduated at Harvard College, 1826; taught for three years; was graduated from Harvard Divinity School in 1832; became pastor at Portsmouth, N. H., 1833; was elected Plummer Professor of Morals and Preacher in Harvard College, 1850; resigned in 1881, being made professor emeritus. He was editor and part proprietor of the *North American Review*, 1853-63, and, in connection with his other duties in the college, acted at various times as Professor of Political Economy, and also of Logic, and had charge of the forensics of the senior class. His published works are numerous, including "Lectures on Christian Doctrine," "Christian (consolation)," "Conversation, its Faults and Graces," "Christianity the Religion of Nature," "Reminiscences of European Travel," "Manual of Moral Philosophy," "Christianity and Science," "Baccalaureate Sermons," and "Christian Belief and Life," besides numerous translations from the classics.

Vermilyea, Rev. Thomas Edward (Dutch Reformed), D.D. (Rutgers and Union Colleges, 1839), LL.D. (Jefferson College, 1856), in New York City, March 18, aged 90. He was graduated from Yale College in 1821; studied at Princeton Theological Seminary, but did not graduate; was ordained by New York Presbytery, 1825; became pastor of the Vandewater Street Church, 1826; removed to West Springfield, Mass., to take charge of the Congregational Church there, 1830; went to Albany to take pastorate of Dutch Reformed Church, 1835; became one of the pastors of the Collegiate Reformed Church in New York, 1839, and retained his connection with that church till his death.

## CALENDAR.

April 24-28. Conference on the "Progress of the Gospel on the Continent," in London. Delegates from the Reformed Churches are expected to be present.

May 4. Inauguration of Rev. Robert Christie, D.D., to the chair of Didactic and Polemic Theology, in the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.

May 10. Annual meeting of the London Mission Society. Dr. A. T. Pierson will preach the sermon.

May 12. Annual meeting of the Woman's Board of Missions of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church at Nashville, Tenn.

May 15. Mid-year meeting of the Board of Managers of the Woman's Centenary Association of the Universalist Church, in Chicago.

May 18. Jubilee Anniversary of the Scotch Disruption, in Edinburgh.

General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church at Little Rock, Ark.; of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., in Washington, D. C.; and of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S., at Macon, Ga.

May 24-25. Anglican Church Congress for Northern and Central Europe at Geneva, under the presidency of Bishop Wilkinsson.

Twenty-fourth Convention of the General Council of the Lutheran Church at Fort Wayne, Ind.